



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

This thesis has been submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for a postgraduate degree (e.g. PhD, MPhil, DClinPsychol) at the University of Edinburgh. Please note the following terms and conditions of use:

This work is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, which are retained by the thesis author, unless otherwise stated.

A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge.

This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the author.

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the author.

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given.

The production of Scottish Open Gardens

Differences in perception of power

Sho Shimoyamada

PhD

The University of Edinburgh

2016

Abstract

Open Gardens are those in private homes that have been opened as visitor attractions, where a proportion of money charged for entry is given to charity. Whilst there is a body of literature on garden visiting, there is little empirical research into garden opening. In addition, the existing studies, which were largely based on quantitative methods, do not differentiate between the roles and perspectives of the various agents who produce garden openings. This research investigates how Open Gardens, under the auspices of the charitable organisation Scotland's Gardens, are collaboratively produced by garden openers, their helpers, volunteers and salaried staff of the organisation.

The principal method of data collection was fieldwork that included participant observations from 39 site visits and 41 semi-structured interviews with the four kinds of producers. Supplementary data were generated from archival documents that record the historical development of Open Gardens. Data collected from fieldwork were analysed and categorised according to themes emerging by means of domain analysis. Each theme was carefully defined and described by creating thematic codes. After the preliminary data analysis, ongoing reading of various social theory literatures drew me towards using concepts of power to more deeply understand the nuanced ways in which the four kinds of producers work together. Hearn's (2012) theoretical framework was employed to examine how power which differs in perception between the various agents in a given social situation operates in the production of Scottish Open Gardens.

The data suggest that the meaning of legitimate power exercised by the producers of Scottish Open Gardens is often highly subjective. Some volunteers were reluctant to fully exercise their power to instruct garden openers because they assumed their request would not be accepted or that it would lead to unwanted conflict. Some garden openers concealed their intentions to show off their horticultural achievements through engagement with Scottish Open Gardens, because they perceived that others would regard pursuing such personal interests to be egocentric. The data also suggest that the production of Scottish Open Gardens is partly dependent on non-human forces such as nature or materials. The quality of gardens,

the number of visitors and the amount raised for charity were determined by weather conditions, public transportation and even the refreshments on offer. The findings highlight the role of such non-human elements in the production of Scottish Open Gardens, and challenges the conventional premise that human-intentionality alone defines agency.

The thesis concludes that the production of Scottish Open Gardens can be more deeply understood by considering the highly fluid, subjective and non-human ways in which power operates. There is no definitively powerful agent present, as the locus of power is continually contested between a rich and complex mixture of human and non-human agents. An implication for practice is that Scotland's Gardens should clarify which agents may be more or less empowered in given aspects of Open Garden production, and the ways in which his or her power can and should be legitimised. The thesis also offers a broad theoretical framework which may help to more deeply understand the subtle power operations present in the co-production of outdoor leisure and tourism pursuits

Declaration

I declare that this thesis has been composed by myself. The work is my own and has not been submitted for any other degree or professional qualification.



Sho Shimoyamada

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I very much appreciate the garden openers, helpers, volunteers and paid workers of Scotland's Gardens. Particularly, the generous cooperation of garden openers was of significance to this research. One of the difficulties that I faced in the course of fieldwork was the access to Open Gardens. This was because I did not own a car and Open Gardens tend to be remote from train stations. However, some garden openers picked me up and dropped me off at train stations. I also struggled to approach helpers whose contact details were not available in the guidebook or on the webpage of Scotland's Gardens, but some garden openers introduced them to me. I could not have completed this thesis without their cooperation and participation in the research.

I also owe thanks to my supervisors, Dr Robbie Nicol and Dr Simon Beams, for their kind support and insightful suggestions. In addition to their professional guidance, it was really kind of them to agree to become my supervisors although we had never met or even been in contact with each other until I came to Edinburgh. Without their agreement to supervise me, I could not start my PhD study. I am also deeply grateful to Elizabeth Leith and Beth Graham for their proofreading work, and to Zoë Vincent, Caroline Maloney and Fiona Eldem for their work in transcribing interviews. Their assistance was crucial as my first language is not English. Many thanks are also given to Jonathan Hearn and his book introducing the subject of power. Its impact was considerable insofar as my research took a direction that was totally unknown to me at the outset of this PhD journey.

Finally, the greatest gratitude is expressed to my parents Masanori and Keiko. Despite your unfamiliarity with the demands of a PhD, you have patiently supported me throughout the degree programme. Now my 22 years of student life terminates, and you will not need to invest in my education anymore. I do not mean to be ironic, but what was priceless to me was that everyone I got to know in this international city and in Open Gardens easily remembered my name. Thank you very much for naming me 'Sho'.

Sho Shimoyamada

Table of contents

Abstract	1
Declaration.....	3
Acknowledgements	4
Table of contents	5
List of abbreviations	8
List of tables	8
Chapter 1: Introduction	10
1.1. What are Open Gardens?	10
1.2. The development of my personal interest in Open Gardens.....	10
1.3. Previous studies on garden opening.....	12
1.4. Definition of parties involved in the co-production of Open Gardens.....	13
1.5. Status display, co-production and power	14
1.6. Value of this research.....	15
1.7. Thesis overview	17
1.8. Chapter summary	19
Chapter 2: Importance of power and its absence in existing studies	20
2.1. Introduction	20
2.2. Meanings of garden in human history and power as a disregarded theme	21
2.2.1. The utilitarian dimension.....	22
2.2.2. The creative dimension.....	25
2.2.3. The spiritual dimension.....	28
2.2.4. The pleasure dimension	30
2.2.5. Gardens as social construction	32
2.2.6. Power dimension	34
2.3. The History of British garden openings	39
2.3.1. Garden visiting/opening by those in power.....	40
2.3.2. Botanic gardens	44
2.3.3. The history of the National Gardens Scheme	47
2.3.4. The history of Scotland's Gardens.....	52
2.4. Critical reviews of existing studies on contemporary garden openings.....	56
2.4.1. The absence of thinking about power	58
2.4.2. Absence of critical views	59
2.4.3. Absence of understanding of all parties concerned	60
2.4.4. Absence of understanding of Scottish Open Gardens.....	61
2.5. Chapter summary and statement of finalised research question	61
Chapter 3: Discourses on Power and Theoretical Framework	64

3.1.	Introduction	64
3.2.	Discourses on power	65
3.2.1.	Marx and Weber: Power as capability and the origin of the traditional domination model	66
3.2.2.	Pareto, Mosca and Gramsci: Location of power in the hierarchical social system.....	68
3.2.3.	Hunter, Mills and Parsons: Power structure and scepticism about the domination model.....	73
3.2.4.	Lukes, Bourdieu and Foucault: Reconsideration of where power exists and how we can discover it	76
3.2.5.	Latour and Callon: Actor-Network-Theory and non-humans as power exerciser	81
3.3.	Hearn's conceptualisation of power	85
3.3.1.	Physical power versus social power	86
3.3.2.	'Power to' versus 'power over'	88
3.3.3.	Domination, authority and legitimacy	90
3.3.4.	Revisiting ANT	96
3.4.	Chapter summary	97
Chapter 4: Methodology		100
4.1.	Introduction	100
4.2.	Research paradigm	101
4.2.1.	Epistemological position	102
4.2.2.	Ontological position	105
4.3.	Research design	108
4.4.	Timeframe of fieldwork.....	112
4.5.	Sampling	115
4.5.1.	Fieldwork location.....	117
4.5.2.	Gaining access to respondents	120
4.6.	Data collection.....	123
4.6.1.	Documentary analysis	124
4.6.2.	Participant observation	128
4.6.3.	Semi-structured interviews.....	134
4.7.	Qualitative data analysis.....	139
4.7.1.	Domain analysis	141
4.7.2.	Creation of codes	144
4.8.	Data verification and trustworthiness.....	147
4.9.	Ethical considerations	151
4.10.	Chapter summary	155

Chapter 5: Findings on physical power: beyond human-intentionality	160
5.1. Introduction	160
5.2. Development of gardens and human-nature relations.....	160
5.3. Non-human elements, materiality and the generation of publicity	165
5.4. Chapter summary	170
Chapter 6: Findings on Social power and interpersonal relationships	172
6.1. Social power of garden openers.....	172
6.1.1. Power relationships between garden openers and helpers: Towards limitation of domination.....	172
6.1.2. Complexities surrounding garden openers' authority and legitimacy	177
6.2. Social power of volunteer organisers: objective versus subjective legitimacy	183
6.2.1. Power relationships between volunteer organisers and garden openers	183
6.2.2. Power relationships between volunteer organisers and SG	194
6.3. Chapter summary	199
Chapter 7: Show-offs and moral justifiability	202
7.1. Introduction	202
7.2. Rise of my personal interest in show-offs	202
7.3. Show-offs in Scottish Open Gardens.....	203
7.4. Chapter summary	208
Chapter 8: Conclusion	210
8.1. Introduction	210
8.2. Recapitulation of research objective, methods and major findings.....	210
8.3. Answer to the research question.....	213
8.4. Contributions to knowledge	214
8.5. Limitations of the research	217
8.6. Implications for practice	218
8.7. Implications for research.....	221
8.8. Concluding comments: Autobiographical reflection.....	222
References	226
Appendices	254

List of abbreviations

SG: Scotland's Gardens

SGS: Scotland's Gardens Scheme

NGS: The National Gardens Scheme

QNI: The Queen's Nursing Institute

List of tables

Table 1: Timeframe of fieldwork (p. 113)

Table 2: Two ways of access to respondents (p. 120)

Table 3: Details of semi-structured interviews (p. 135 – 137)

Table 4: Example for domain and sub-domain (p. 142)

Table 5: Example for taxonomy (p. 143)

Table 6: Example for inter-domain relationship (p. 143)

Table 7: Example for code (p. 146)

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1. What are Open Gardens?

Open Gardens¹ are a nation-wide phenomenon in which gardening enthusiasts open their private gardens to the public under two national organisations: the National Gardens Scheme (NGS) and Scotland's Gardens (SG). The historical development of SG is inseparable from its predecessor the NGS. Founded in 1927, the NGS organises more than 3700 Open Gardens in England and Wales every year. It initially started as a way to cover the cost of the pensions for district nurses educated by the Queen's Nursing Institute. Followed by the success of the NGS, SG also officially started practising Open Gardens in Scotland in 1931 to raise money for nurses educated by the Queen's Nursing Institute Scotland. Nowadays, more than 350 gardens are open in co-operation with SG. Both bodies annually publish official guidebooks so that people can select gardens to visit. With the exception of children, visitors are charged to enter. Profits are also made from visitor attractions such as plant sales or catering services. The NGS and SG donate some of the profits from the entrance fee, refreshments and plants to a range of beneficiaries on behalf of the garden openers, that is, people who open their private gardens to the public. More precisely, the NGS and SG allow 'garden openers' (as I will call them) to raise 40% of the gross income for charities they nominate, and 60% (net earnings) is raised for registered beneficiaries. These are, in Open Gardens under the auspices of SG, the Queen's Nursing Institute Scotland, the Garden Fund of the National Trust for Scotland, Maggie's Cancer Caring Centres and Perennial.

1.2. The development of my personal interest in Open Gardens

I graduated from Tokai University in 2010 with a bachelor's degree in Sport and Leisure Management. I then received a master's degree in 2012 from the same university. Having been inspired by a view that sport is just one aspect of leisure, I have always tried to broaden my mind and take a holistic approach to leisure. The focus of my bachelor's thesis was re-thinking the meaning of affluence through

¹ By 'Open Gardens' I exclusively mean garden openings under the auspices of the NGS or SG. This is because the term 'Open Garden' is used in Aida's (2002) doctoral thesis on the historical development of the NGS, and his thesis is the most detailed and holistic work in this area, which I shall come back in 2.3.3. To avoid confusion, other kinds of garden openings held by different organisations in different countries and for different purposes are just called 'garden openings' in this research and differentiated from the Open Garden under the NGS and SG.

considering the increasing (in those days) popularity of beverages with zero calories, zero fat, zero sugar and zero alcohol.

In early summer of 2010, I happened to watch a TV programme about the British Open Gardens by chance and it strongly drew my attention. The Open Garden introduced in the programme was very intriguing to me. Judging from scenes of the programme that depicted ladies chatting over tea in manicured gardens, I assumed that this was an aspect of the culture of those who are financially affluent. This assumption instantly linked in my mind to Thorstein Veblen's (1889) widely acclaimed book *The Theory of the Leisure Class* that had entirely shaped my stereotype of Western leisure experiences amongst the nobility.

I felt compelled to see Open Gardens for myself so visited London twice in the summer of 2011. My initial visits to eight Open Gardens in London left me with mixed impressions. On the one hand, Open Gardens very much lived up to my expectations. Some Open Gardens were a genuine exemplification of the noble leisure culture that I had stereotyped. Summoning up as much courage as possible, I spoke to a lady who seemed to be the garden owner. The fact that she called me 'a gentleman' was enough to cause me, who had spent most of my life in Japan, to labour under a misapprehension that I had stepped into the world that Veblen described. On the other hand, there was also some disappointment at not seeing 'snobs' and the growing sense that I had misunderstood much of what I had been thinking with regard to contemporary Open Gardens. Some gardens were tiny and untidy. Such gardens and interactions between their owners and myself did not align with what could be described as 'posh', 'upper class' or 'luxurious'. Whilst in my master's dissertation I reported a garden owner who showed off pictures of a royal visit and numerous trophies of horticultural awards as an example of conspicuous leisure, I began to think that my perspective was limited and not sufficiently open to a comprehensive examination of Open Gardens.

As Galbraith (1958) questions, the applicability of Veblen's thinking on the leisure class to contemporary societies has been subject to doubt. Contrary to Veblen, Rojek

(2000) draws a counter-argument that nowadays the rich are not characterised by detachment from work, and rather typically work longer hours than average. Murphy (2016) also questions the sustainability of the Veblenian status-seeking by claiming that some of today's elites refrain from flaunting their socio-economic achievements because they perceive such ostentatious displays of socio-economic status as symbolising low status. Instead of hoping to contextualise Open Gardens with the Veblenian viewpoint of leisure, the necessity of a more holistic perspective on leisure and a more flexible attitude towards Open Gardens arose accordingly. Thus, 'How do garden owners display or signal their status through Open Gardens?', was the original question from which this research began.

1.3. Previous studies on garden opening

The interest in status displaying or signalling drove me to investigate Open Gardens more rigorously as a PhD project. As my initial task, I reviewed previous studies on garden openings. This was necessary since Tokai University holds limited access to the database of English academic sources. Notwithstanding the fact that there have been numerous existing studies on garden visiting (Connell, 2005, 2004, 2002; Fox, 2007, 2006; Fox, Edwards and Wilkes, 2010; Gallagher, 1983; Jashimuddin, Alamgir, Majumder, Patwary and Bhuiyan, 2004; Kohlleppel, Bradley and Jacob, 2002; Tipples and Gibbons, 1992), little is known about garden opening. Garden opening should be differentiated from garden visiting because, as observed in Connell's (2002) distinction between demand and supply sides, those who produce garden openings have utterly different roles and responsibilities from those of garden visitors.

Connell (2005) and Tipples and Gibbons (1992) looked into garden opening as a subsidiary interest. In addition, Kay, Hede, Inglis and Polonsky (2008), Lipovská (2013) and Ryan and Bates (1995) researched garden opening. These studies will be more rigorously examined in Chapter 2, however it is worth noting at the outset of this thesis that they did not shed light on how garden openings are collaboratively produced by garden owners and different kinds of associates. Tipples and Gibbons (1992) solely focused on garden owners; Connell (2002) distributed questionnaire

surveys to gardens and did not clarify whose perspective the survey targeted; and Kay et al. (2008) collectively reported perspectives of garden owners and other parties concerned. Thus, the previous studies did not clearly reveal who was involved in the production of garden openings, who had what responsibilities and how they collaborated and cooperated to produce garden openings.

In Open Gardens under the SG, there are not only garden owners, but also their helpers, volunteers and salaried staff of SG. For the purpose of this thesis, they are all 'co-producers' who contribute to the running of Open Gardens in different ways. Connell (2002), who conducted one of the existing studies on garden visiting in the UK, suggested that the operation of the NGS, which is equivalent to SG in Scotland, is a fruitful orientation for further research. For these reasons, I began to address the question of 'how are Open Gardens co-produced by garden owners and their associates?'

1.4. Definition of parties involved in the co-production of Open Gardens

As explained above, the co-production of Open Gardens is an identified gap in the research. There are four kinds of parties involved in the co-production: garden openers, helpers, volunteers and the staff of SG. In order to clarify whom I refer to by these names, their definitions are given below.

- **Garden opener:** Those who open their private gardens to the public under SG. Garden openers do not necessarily hold ownership of the garden. Those who have close relationships with the owner, such as sons (in-law) or daughters (in-law), are regarded as garden openers in instances where they take principal responsibility for the orchestration of Open Gardens. One might find the term 'garden opener' awkward or cumbersome, but it is more precise to call them so to differentiate them from garden owners. It was possible to detect who plays the locus role in Open Gardens, but it was unrealistic to rigorously check garden ownership by requesting people who appeared to be owners to certify their ownership.
- **Helper:** Those who help garden openers with the running of Open Gardens,

mostly on public open days. Their typical responsibilities are to ensure the event runs smoothly and successfully and involves entrance administration, plant sales and provision of refreshments in the gardens. Some garden openers employ gardeners or housekeepers, whereas some helpers are just their friends.

- **Volunteers:** Those who voluntarily work for SG as District Organisers, Area Organisers, Treasurers or Trustee members. District Organisers have the most important role as they have a variety of responsibilities such as the nomination of new gardens, the judgement of garden quality and the distribution of marketing materials.

- **Staff of Scotland's Gardens:** Those who work in the charitable organisation Scotland's Gardens, which runs Open Gardens all over Scotland. The staff of SG include the Chief Executive and Administrators whose position is subordinate to that of the former. Unlike volunteers, SG staff are salaried, and in this thesis they are collectively labelled 'SG' or 'SG staff' where appropriate.

In this current thesis, all of the above kinds of people are collectively called 'producers' or 'co-producers' where appropriate. It is also noteworthy that these definitions can be imperfect in some cases, as there are overlaps of producers. It is common for garden openers to help their friends' Open Gardens with catering, plant sales or admission. Some enthusiastic garden openers volunteer as District/Area organisers or other kinds of volunteer workers. Since the volunteers work in close co-operation with the staff of SG, the boundary between the two might also be vague. These definitions are, however, necessary for operational reasons, and will help to structure the analysis.

1.5. Status display, co-production and power

I have thus far presented the two original themes from which this research stemmed: status display and co-production of Open Gardens. These themes will be examined through the same analytical tool, namely, power. Originally, power did not play a central role in this inquiry. However, after conducting the preliminary data analysis

and revisiting a body of previously-reviewed literature on gardens, I arrived at the consideration of power as a quintessential theme that deepens the understanding of both status display and co-production. A body of literature that I consulted suggested that the status display is by nature closely related to the manifestation of power. For garden openers, Open Gardens might be an opportunity to let others be aware of how powerful they are. The data analysis indicated that the co-production of Scottish Open Gardens includes complex procedures in which one party necessarily exercises power over others in very nuanced ways. The different kinds of interpersonal relationships, conflicts of interests and the necessity of inducement and compromise that I observed during fieldwork are all examined, more effectively, by the analytical tool of power.

In addition to the status display and the co-production of Scottish Open Gardens, the subject of power also shed light on human perceptions of non-human elements that are inseparably involved in the production of Scottish Open Gardens. Field data suggested that nature, its inhabitants and materials that are made of natural resources are influential factors in the successful or unsuccessful management of Scottish Open Gardens. Thus, the subject of power not only determined the analytical pathway of this research, but also widened its scope.

1.6. Value of this research

It is generally understood in academia that “the PhD is awarded for ‘an original contribution to knowledge’” (Phillips, Pugh and Johnson, 2015: 74). The research that underpins this thesis, outlined above and detailed below, will contribute to knowledge in different ways. As indicated in the above quote, the matter of originality is key. One of the definitions of originality is to conduct research in an understudied or unexplored area (Cryer, 2006; Gill and Dolan, 2015; Guetzkow, Lamont and Mallard, 2004). Benfield (2013) identifies visiting private gardens open to the public as one type of garden-related leisure and tourism pursuit. Whilst there are leisure and tourism studies on garden visiting, as noted earlier, the previous studies on garden openings did not yield sufficient knowledge of different kinds of parties who are on the production side of garden openings. In this light, this research

into the production of Scottish Open Gardens will fill a gap in the knowledge of leisure and tourism phenomena. Deepening the understanding of the experiences of the production side of leisure and tourism helps not only academics, but also practitioners, as they work to enhance consumer satisfaction in leisure and tourism pursuits (Morgan, Lugosi and Brent, 2010). Findings reported in the latter part of this thesis have useful implications for researchers with similar interests and for practitioners who run garden openings and try to deliver memorable and enjoyable experiences to visitors.

Another common definition of originality is a methodological contribution or the employment of new procedures for generating data (Cryer, 2006; Gill and Dolan, 2015; Guetzkow et al., 2004; Wisker, 2012). Unlike the previous studies that largely relied on quantitative approaches (Connell, 2005, 2002; Tipples and Gibbons, 1992; Kay et al., 2008; Ryan and Bates, 1995), this research employed qualitative methods. Connell (2002), who undertook one of the existing studies, recommended using qualitative approaches because they are highly suited for research into the psychology of garden visiting and opening. The qualitative approaches used in this research explore the subjective feelings of those who produce garden openings.

Originality can also mean using new theoretical frameworks (Gill and Dolan, 2015; Guetzkow et al., 2004; Phillips et al., 2015; Wisker, 2012). As I will discuss in 2.4.1, the previous studies on garden opening and visiting did not consider the subject of power. As Coles and Church (2007) note, there is a nexus between power and tourism, but the linkage is lurking in the background so that researchers are unaware of its importance. This research takes power seriously, and contextualises it with findings by employing Hearn's (2012) power framework. The thesis therefore demonstrates how Hearn's power framework is systematically used for the analysis of garden openings.

As stated above, the thesis offers contextual, methodological and theoretical contributions to knowledge. Nevertheless, the originality of this research may not yet be fully demonstrated. Even though I regard my research as new in terms of its topic,

method and theoretical framework, as Gill and Dolan (2015) warn, such a standalone statement may fail to substantiate the meaningfulness of doctoral research. The concept of originality is, Gill and Dolan (ibid) further stress, fundamentally a criterion that is supposed to be considered at the end of PhD, rather than its beginning (Gill and Dolan, ibid). The purpose, approach and outcome of this research are carefully and coherently explained throughout this thesis. In order to examine the originality of this research, the thesis requires to be read from the Introduction to the Conclusion.

1.7. Thesis overview

The thesis consists of eight chapters. In Chapter 2, I will review a body of literature on the meaning of garden, the history of British garden opening, the development of Open Gardens under the NGS and SG, and existing studies on garden openings. The review of literature will justify the necessity of this research and will further emphasise the importance of power in this research. Chapter 3 will more rigorously explore the subject of power itself. I will initially discuss existing discourses on power in order to delineate what aspects of power should be considered with respect to Scottish Open Gardens. I will then introduce Jonathan Hearn's (2012) power conceptualisation as a specific theoretical framework that I utilise to explain my findings. In Chapter 4, I will explain the research paradigm and practical methods of this research, including research design, sampling procedure, data collection and data analysis. The present research is methodologically differentiated from the previous studies on garden openings, and is positioned as qualitative research. The reasoning behind this will be offered in more detail in this chapter.

After the methodology chapter, I will move on to findings. There are three findings chapters. Chapter 5 will focus on the importance of physical power and its operation in the relationship between human beings and non-human factors. Data generated from fieldwork will illustrate how different kinds of non-human forces such as nature or materiality are inextricably intertwined with human creations of Scottish Open Gardens. I will challenge the principle of human-intentionality that conventionally

defines ‘agency’ and the stance that excludes non-human elements from the scope of analysis.

Chapter 6 will explore the social aspects of power. The data will show how limited the concept of domination is when examining subtle interpersonal relationships between the co-producers. I will orientate the focus of analysis, along the lines of Hearn’s (2012) suggestion, towards authority and legitimacy, and will discuss what turns power into authority and how power becomes legitimate. The primary focus of discussion in this chapter will be the power of District and Area Organisers. By describing their three important responsibilities, which are the inspection of gardens, the arrangement of open days and the distribution of marketing materials, I will highlight the particularly nuanced ways in which the organisers exercise their power to coordinate garden openers and the SG staff. As an important analytical theme regarding the power of volunteer organisers, the subjective aspect of legitimacy will be discussed.

Chapter 7 will be about garden openers’ desire to show off their gardens. I will describe how they feel and perceive the display of their horticultural achievements. Even though some of the garden openers with whom I conducted interviews implied their interest in showing off their gardens, they did not want to look arrogant or boastful. This is because they perceived that the act of flaunting their horticultural achievement is not socially acceptable. Their emotional narratives will confirm the significance of subjectivity to the judgement on the legitimacy of power exercised by the co-producers.

Chapter 8, the conclusion, recapitulates the research objective, methods and major findings. By encapsulating salient points made in the findings chapters, I will answer the research question that is articulated at the end of Chapter 2, and highlight the contribution to knowledge and the limitations of this research. I will then suggest implications for practice and research. The thesis will conclude with my autobiographical reflection.

1.8. Chapter summary

This introductory chapter explained how my interest in Open Gardens arose. The research originally stemmed from Veblen's (1889) concept of conspicuous consumption. However, its applicability to today's leisure contexts is questionable, and it was suggested that a more flexible attitude towards Open Gardens was required. The brief overview of previous studies on garden openings indicates that a gap in knowledge lies in the co-production of Open Gardens. I signposted that power, as a quintessential theme, would deepen the understanding of status display and co-production of Open Gardens. In the next chapter, I will review a body of literature on gardens and garden openings, and will more carefully stress the importance of examining the subject of power in this research into Open Gardens.

Chapter 2: Importance of power and its absence in existing studies

2.1. Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to emphasise the importance of power in the context of gardens and most significantly how scholars, up to this point, have not used the subject of power to theorise or to understand the nature of contemporary garden openings. I will first discuss the meaning of power. Power is absent most notably in Connell's (2002) doctoral study on garden visiting in the UK, in which she identifies five meanings, or dimensions, of gardens. These dimensions include utilitarian, creative, spiritual, pleasure and gardens as 'social construction'. Whilst this typology covers various aspects of gardens, it does not mention power explicitly. Therefore, I will add power as an added and explicit dimension to highlight its importance as a broad theme that deepens the understanding of the other five meanings of gardens.

The development of garden opening and visiting in the UK will then be explained by giving an outline of garden opening and visiting by those in power, of the development of botanic gardens and of the history of the National Gardens Scheme and Scotland's Gardens that run Open Gardens in the UK. The origins of garden opening and visiting were predominantly the private practice of members of the nobility or aristocracy, through the development of botanic gardens and the two Open Garden schemes. However, over time garden opening and visiting has gradually become a popular leisure experience amongst the general public. Therefore, widening access and participation is a significant theme of the historical development of British garden openings, and is one to which I will return.

Finally, existing studies on today's garden openings will be critically reviewed. Despite the fact that the historical sources imply its importance in the context of gardens in general and of past garden openings in particular, power has not been debated in the previous studies on contemporary garden openings. Hence, the gap in knowledge lies first and foremost in the ways in which power operates in the contemporary garden openings. In keeping with this limitation of the existing studies, this chapter will conclude with the restatement of the research question.

2.2. Meanings of garden in human history and power as a disregarded theme

In this section, I will describe meanings of garden in relation to power. The meaning of the word 'garden' has been ambiguous. As Adshead (2012) suggests, it is perhaps useful in the first place to recount how humans have historically engaged in gardens. Since gardens have played widely differing roles in their long history, it would be confusing for an introductory part of a single research thesis to scrutinise their numerous potential meanings. In her PhD thesis on the supply and demand of garden visiting in the UK, Connell (2002) classifies the meaning of gardens into five dimensions: utilitarian, creative, pleasure, spiritual and gardens as 'social construction'. Her categorisation encapsulates salient aspects of gardens, and is therefore a useful facilitator of the exploration of garden meanings. In addition to this, another important rationale behind the selection of Connell's (2002) typology is that she discusses these dimensions particularly from the viewpoint of garden opening and visiting. Her work therefore implies what kind of meaning is potentially of importance to garden visiting or opening.

This typology, however, has a limitation - it does not explicitly consider power despite its importance being tacitly presented in each meaning that she identifies. I will therefore add the dimension of power to the typology at the end of this section. Importantly, Connell (2002) makes the classification mostly by introducing different definitions of garden, but I will mostly refer to practical descriptions of human connections with gardens so that Connell's abstract accounts can be visualised. In other words, although her typology will be used as a framework that structures this section, examples attached to each meaning are mostly my own. The subject field of the literature that I am referring to in this section varies. Examples given to explain past human relations to gardens mostly fall into the broad umbrella of landscape architecture. Present examples are cited from horticulture, leisure and tourism studies and human geography. Terms that refer to divisions of time period such as 'modern' are loosely defined in this section, as sometimes there is no consensual meaning of such terms. The ultimate aim of this section is to emphasise power as a territory that needs to be further investigated, and as a theme that potentially deepens the understanding of each aforementioned meaning of the garden.

2.2.1. The utilitarian dimension

Connell (2002) construes the term ‘utilitarian dimension’ as the antithesis of aesthetic and decorative pursuance in garden creation, and implicates the usefulness and functionalism of the garden. Etymologically, the term ‘garden’ originates from an Old English word ‘*geard fence*’ that means ‘enclosed space’, and enclosure is therefore the most basic feature of gardens (van Erp-Houtepen, 1986). Outdoor spaces are enclosed for human use. The Oxford Online Dictionary (accessed on 20th July 2016) defines the term ‘garden’ as “an enclosed piece of ground devoted to the cultivation of flowers, fruit, or vegetables; often preceded by some defining word, such as flower-, fruit-, kitchen-, market-, strawberry-garden, etc”. Apparently, this kind of definition presupposes the productivity of the garden. Gardens are outdoor settings where people grow plants, whether edible or not. Gardens were particularly closely associated with the way of living in ancient civilisation. The following description extracted from Homer’s *Odyssey* would offer an idyllic image of ancient Greek palace gardens.

Outside the courtyard, near the entrance, is a great garden of four acres, with a fence running round, this way and that. Here are planted tall thriving trees – pears, pomegranates, apples with glistening fruits, sweet figs, rich olives. The fruit of all these never fails or flags all the year round, winter or summer; here the west wind is always breathing – some fruits it brings to birth, some to ripeness. Pear upon pear matures to fullness, apple on apple, grape-cluster on grape-cluster, fig on fig. There too the king has his fruitful vineyard planted; behind is a warm and level spot, dried by the sun, where some grapes are being gathered and others trodden; in front there are unripe grapes that have scarcely shed their blossom, and others already faintly darkening. There too, bordering the last row of vines, are trim plots of all kinds of herbs that keep fresh all the year round. Lastly there are two springs of water, and one of these is channelled out over the whole space of garden; the other, facing it, flows under the entrance of the courtyard to issue in front of the lofty palace; and from this the townspeople drew their water. (Homer, translated by Shewring, 2008: 79)

This Homeric reference to a court garden describes the different kinds of fruits grown there. The fruits are continually grown, harvested and consumed. The use of such plants grown in the gardens varied. Turner (2005) explains that they were used to make medicines, to make drinks, to feed bees, to make garlands and to provide shade from the sun. Homer refers to water streams as well. The irrigation system in

ancient Egyptian gardens or atriums, the peristyle or colonnaded porch in ancient Roman gardens are a substantiation of the use of, or more precisely, the storage of, water in cases where water shortage is caused by severe droughts (Turner, 2005; Wilkinson, 1998). To comprehend the Utilitarian dimension of a garden, it might also be useful to touch on architectural features in close proximity to the gardens. Ancient Roman cities had a dining room called the triclinium. According to Jashemski (1996), a triclinium excavated in a Tunisian site was situated reasonably next to a place where leftovers were burned. Similarly, Carroll (2003) mentions that vegetable beds or vineyards found in Pompeii were situated next to the kitchen so that residents could pick up the vegetables or fruit quickly. These are both examples of the materialisation of convenience in dwelling places of human beings. Whatever the practice, the utilisation in the garden was accompanied with the modification of natural resources or natural settings. In order to benefit from nature, ancient Italians intentionally turned plants into different forms, or purposefully placed objects where suitable. Thus, the precondition for the utilisation of nature was the possession of physical control over nature. Below I show how such demands for physical control over nature and for the utilisation of nature are satisfied in the modern and contemporary contexts.

In recent times, it would not be straightforward for inhabitants in densely populated cities to own a piece of land, to cultivate it and to grow vegetables or flowers there. One contemporary gardening practice that solves this dilemma is the allotment. It is defined as “a plot of land, not attached to a house, in a field divided into similar plots, surrounded by a common external fence but without internal partitions” (Burchardt 2002: 243). The emergence of the allotment in Britain was accompanied with tackling the poverty and food scarcity that was originally caused by the rapid growth of the British population. Armstrong (1988) explains that the agrarian improvement in rural areas, which was manifested in enclosure, led to the reduction of animal diseases such as brucellosis or bovine tuberculosis, and hence the human population increased dramatically; rising by 365.7% from 1801 to 1901 in England and Wales, and by 278.1% in Scotland (Mitchell and Phyllis, 1962). Despite the increasing population, employment opportunity was limited. Accordingly, the idea of providing

people with a piece of land began to attract attention. Burchardt (2002) views the emergence of the allotment as identical to a reference made by the Earl of Winchilsea within a report of the Society for Bettering the Conditions and Increasing the Comforts of the Poor (1802), remarking that four acres of land were “to be allotted in gardens, for the labouring poor” (150; also quoted in Burchardt, 2002: 240).

The allotment movement led to legal support and the foundation of different organisations. DeSilvey (2004, 2003) describes that in 1901, the National Society of Allotment and Leisure Gardeners was inaugurated as the representative body of the national allotment movement in Britain. In Scotland, DeSilvey (2004, 2003) further notes, a petition for allotment provision for the ‘labouring population’ was empowered by the Allotments (Scotland) Act in 1892. Unlike its original form, the aim of today’s allotment would not exclusively be to tackle poverty. Burchardt and Cooper (2010) mention, with the co-operation of the Family and Community Historical Research Society, that not only the unemployed, but also a wide variety of tenants are included as plot holders in England. In terms of the profile of allotment holders, Acton (2011) reported that from 1900 to 2010, plot holders in Ilford and Redbridge were primarily from the professional and middle classes, and all of the holders saw their allotments as a hobby. Now the rationale behind the participation in allotments is to diminish their carbon footprint by consuming foods harvested there (Burchard-Dziubińska, 2014), to seek therapeutic effects (Duncan, 2005) and to achieve a healthier life-style by eating chemical-free foods (Buckingham, 2005). When it comes to allotments, it is interesting to note the common imbalance between supply and demand. According to Campbell and Campbell’s (2011) latest survey, the number of people on the waiting lists is 57 per plot in England.

From the sources provided above, it is clear that the reasons for participation in allotments, or for gardening more generally, have changed. Nowadays, the use of garden as a means of maintenance of the minimum living standard may not be as important as it used to be, but thinking of gardens in terms of their utilitarian uses is a reminder of people’s strong desires to cultivate and harvest. More importantly, such desires are met in unison with the transformation of natural resources. The physical

control over nature is therefore closely associated with creativity in the garden, which I describe in detail in the next subsection.

2.2.2. The creative dimension

This subsection will briefly outline garden features that demonstrate creativity. This dimension is particularly instructive in understanding the garden as an alteration or transformation of natural resources. The garden is quasi-natural and different from the wholly untouched natural environment (Mausner, 1996). As Connell (2002) emphasises, the prominent idea that underlies the creation of the garden is human control over nature.

In order to perceive the creative dimension of a garden, it is perhaps useful to describe design features of past gardens. In the early period of human history, the presentation of creativity might have been equivalent to the addition of artificiality to the gardens. Researchers in the field of landscape architecture, not surprisingly, tend to report the presence of architectures in the gardens and the characteristics of the architecture. For example, when describing Persian gardens a key term to consider is represented in *Chahar Bagh*. In the Persian language, ‘*chahar*’ and ‘*bagh*’ mean ‘four’ and ‘gardens’ respectively (Farahani, Motamed and Jamei, 2016). As semantically indicated, this style of garden is rectangular in shape, and divided into four sections by water streams (Harvey, 1987; Pinder-Wilson, 1976; Wilber, 1979).

Some argue that the Persian’s appreciation of regularity significantly influenced European gardens in the Middle Ages. For example, Harvey (1987) describes the medieval monastery garden owned by Henry the Poet as a Western counterpart of the Persian *Chahar Bagh*, highlighting the suitability of the fourfold design for the herbarium. Thus, the poet planted different kinds of herbs in different areas according to their types. Nevertheless, it is inaccurate to assume that the concept of regularity completely spilled over into Western gardens. MacDougall (1972) shows scepticism about this assumption, taking the *Villa Lante*, an Italian Renaissance garden at Bagnaia, as an example. A bird’s-eye view of the garden depicts its left side occupied by enclosed areas and its right side consisting of a large number of trees. Therefore, the garden was not, as a whole, symmetrically designed. On the one hand,

the Renaissance revived ancient garden features – but on the other hand, there was certainly the emergence of a new wave. Thacker (1979), for instance, mentions that the chateau at Gallion and its French Renaissance garden were an appreciation of both regularity and irregularity. Similarly, Masson (1972) highlights that in the seventeenth century, a number of gardens were designed free from the dominance of constructions. The idea of being different from artificiality gradually increased its importance in this period.

The antithesis of artificiality was perhaps exemplified in a visible manner by English landscape gardens. Aiming to harmonise with the natural environment, the landscape gardens are visualised as the composition of vague boundaries between the garden and the outer environment by means of a ha-ha, instead of enclosing walls (Hunt and Willis, 1988), curved pathways (Hadfield, 1979), serpentine lakes and undulating lawns (Laird, 1999). In a broader context, the mind that celebrates and appreciates natural resources may have been nurtured in this period. According to Brown (1904), in 1535, in Scotland, legislation forced those who owned lands worth more than a hundred pounds (Scots pounds) to plant woods or orchards around their houses. This legislation was a result of the increasing interest in preserving woods and encouraging planting (Fergusson, 1956). The sources provided above show a shift from the appreciation of artificial regularity to a growing awareness of the beauty of natural outlines or shapes and of the conservation of nature. Even though this does not mean that humans completely stopped their pursuit of control over nature, one might observe a nuanced change in its quality. The design feature of English landscape gardens implies that conquering nature was not the central interest.

Today, one of the newly emerging gardening-related phenomena is guerrilla gardening which, unlike the aforementioned law, is characterised by the absence of ownership of the land one cultivates. One of the leading guerrilla gardeners, Richard Reynolds (2014), puts it as:

I do not wait for permission to become a gardener but dig wherever I see horticultural potential. I do not just tend existing gardens but create them from

neglected space. I, and thousands of people like me, step out from home to garden land we do not own. (Reynolds, 2014: 4)

Even though the term ‘guerrilla garden’ is relatively new, some argue that the idea itself has existed over decades, or centuries. Reynolds (2014) claims that it originates from the gardening or cultivation conducted by an underprivileged merchant called Gerrard Winstanley on St George’s Hill in England in 1649. Tracey (2013) suggests that the origin of guerrilla gardening could date back to the biblical account of Adam and Eve although the best-known modern example is the campaign against the conversion of a park into a parking lot, which occurred in Berkeley in America, in 1969. Opposing the University of California who owned the park, the citizens of Berkeley protested against the conversion in order to provide a space for political expression, showing solidarity with the homeless (Baudry 2012). Thus, this early example of guerrilla gardening took the form of the general public’s resistance to the university’s authoritative decision to turn the park into a parking space. Importantly, this protest was carried out by cultivating the natural setting. Other prominent practices of guerrilla gardening include the Green Guerrilla movement led by Liz Christy in 1973 and the Garden of Eden begun by Adam Purple in 1975. Both movements emerged in New York. Swartwood (2012) explains that this series of citizen-led efforts were intended to clean up vacant lots, improve safety and build social bonds in the neighbourhoods. Whether the land cultivated is owned by the cultivator or not, people have interpreted the lands they cultivated as gardens. As noted earlier, the defining characteristic of guerrilla gardening is the unpermitted cultivation of land. Guerrilla gardening is unique because it raises questions regarding the legitimacy of human control over nature.

In this section, I described the fourfold design of Persian garden Chahah Bagh and of the medieval monastery garden owned by Henry the Poet as design features that exemplify the creative dimension of gardens. Artificial regularity, however, is not the only style that represents creativity in the garden. As typically demonstrated by English landscape gardens, humans have also appreciated irregularity and natural shapes in the garden. As a newly-emerging gardening practice, I also featured guerrilla gardening. The creativity of guerrilla gardeners is embodied by the

unpermitted cultivation of lands of which they do not hold the ownership. The commonality between the aforementioned examples is that they orientate our attention to nuances of human control over nature. Gardens are quasi-natural settings (Mausner, 1996), and hence the creative dimension reminds us that some contrived addition to nature is taken for granted in the garden. However, this does not necessarily mean that human beings absolutely rule nature. Creativity in the garden can be materialised in harmony with nature, and could potentially lose its legitimacy on some occasions. Overall, the implication from the creative dimension is the difference in human perceptions of natural landscapes.

2.2.3. The spiritual dimension

In the last subsection, I described the different kinds of uses for gardens, but did not look at why people create, cultivate or utilise gardens. Therefore, I will now turn to the underpinning rationales. To begin with, I outline the spiritual dimension associated with the gardens. From ancient to medieval societies, spiritual impulses have influenced the creation of the gardens. For example, the height of the Hanging Garden at Babylon in ancient Mesopotamia can be regarded as the visualisation of a link between heaven and hell (Berrall, 1978). Similarly, the design of Chahar Bagh, the previously mentioned quadripartite garden in ancient Persia, symbolises the cosmological concept of Islam (Farahani et al., 2016). Dickie (1976) argues that an Islamic ceramic, which dates back to approximately 4000 BC, depicts the world symmetrically separated into four divisions, and furthermore, the concept of this world divided into four is closely associated with Buddhist images of mandala, a pictorial and geometric representation of the universe. John Reid and his book 'The Scots Gard'ner' (1683) have been interpreted as being pivotal in advocating the central positioning of the house in the garden. For him it was an introduction to an anthropomorphic and cosmological analogy (Lowrey, 2007), and his idea of the house in a landscape was expressed as a microcosm of something much larger.

As the Sun is the Centre of this World; as the Heart of the man is the Centre of the man; as the nose the Centre of the face; and as it is unseemly to see man wanting a leg, an arm &c. or his nose standing at one fide the face, or not streight, or wanting a cheek, an eye, an eare, or with one (or all of them) great at one fide and small on the other; Just so with the House-courts, Avenues,

Gardens, Orchards, &c. where regularity or uniformity is not observed. (Reid, 1683: 2)²

It is not only the garden designs, but also the selection of plants that symbolically represent aspects of spirituality. I will take gardens in the Mughal Empire as an example. Akbar, who was the second ruler of the empire, had a garden with cypress avenues. In light of the fact that the cypress is a conifer that never loses its leaves, Jellicoe (1976) claims that the garden was a symbol of death and eternity. In the middle ages, similarly, plants were believed to symbolise spiritual meanings. Johan Huizinga (1996), who works intensively on the medieval age, makes detailed descriptions of the representation of colours. For example, black, particularly black velvet, represents “the proud, sombre splendour that the time loved, with its arrogant distance from gay wealth of colour found everywhere” (Huizinga, 1996; 326). This indicates the multiple interpretations that exist when plants are thought of in terms of their colour. Eco (2002) mentions that red and white roses symbolised the virgins and martyrs respectively. The spiritual meaning of gardens is also presented in the Christian concept of death. According to Landsberg (2003), the garden of Christ Church in Canterbury, which was planned by Prior Wilbert, was a peaceful and relaxing setting for elderly monks suffering from incurable diseases.

I have given an overview of spiritual and religious rationales behind specific design features or choices of plants, by introducing several past examples. As Head and Atchison (2009) note, plants have drawn considerable scholarly attention, particularly where they are expected to hold symbolic, spiritual or charismatic power. Whether spirituality is represented as a form of design or by the selection of plants, the themes they symbolised were mostly deep-rooted in cosmology, specifically the notion of life, death and the afterlife. It might be unrealistic for most contemporary gardeners to embrace such cosmological meanings. I will now address another meaning with which today’s gardeners may feel more familiar, that is, gardens’ relaxing, therapeutic and recreational effects.

² Spellings of some of the words appealing in this quote are old fashioned. The words ‘Streight’, ‘ane’ and ‘eare’ mean ‘straight’, ‘an’ and ‘ear’ respectively. The alphabet of [s] was originally written as ‘long s’, but was replaced with [s] as the typography of Old English is not compatible with Word.

2.2.4. The pleasure dimension

Gardens are also a space for seeking pleasure, or positive psychological effect more generally. Before introducing specific examples for this, I would like to touch on the concept of pleasure in a broader context. Aristotle (translated by Barker, 1995) positioned leisure as an antithesis of work, stating “this is the condition, not of those who are at work, but of those who are at leisure” (301). Furthermore, the concept of pleasure has been one of the defining ideas of leisure (Highland, 2005). Max Weber’s (1930) claim that Protestantism was the driving force for the growth of the capitalist society is widely known. On the one hand, the disciplined work ethic emerged along with the Puritan revolution. On the other hand, there was also an increasing awareness of the reduction of recreational opportunities. Satisfaction of recreational demand was in part dependent upon the existence of outside settings. Malcolmson (1973) describes how the enclosure movement from the early to mid-19th century caused a decrease in fields where the poor could play sports, and deprived their recreational opportunities. It was therefore essential for taking pleasure in engaging in leisure pursuits to secure spaces available for them.

The demand for recreation was also presented in the context of gardens. In 1646, apprentices in London submitted a petition to Parliament in order to call for ‘legitimate’ recreational activities for the needful refreshment of their mental health (Hutton, 2001). According to Marcuse (1974), their need for recreation was perceived to be both realistic and urgent because of the drastic technological improvements. Arcangeli (2003) remarks that in those days, gardening became recognised as a pleasurable activity, quoting a passage written by the French moralist, Jean Frain du Tremblay:

In that condition, man would therefore have worked in the same way in which we see some people work in their gardens, without perceiving any tiredness, because it brings them much pleasure and since, not being obliged as mercenaries to work for their subsistence, they always quit work before getting tired. (Frain du Tremblay, 1685: 18-19; translated by Arcangeli, 2003: 12)

In this piece of writing, the garden is perceived as a symbol of the pleasurable state of being free from the obligation of labour. Francis Bacon (1985) has stated that

“God Almighty first planted a Garden; and, indeed, it is the purest of human pleasures; it is the greatest refreshment to the spirits of man” (198). Following this line of reasoning, the perception of pleasure derived from gardens might have been something deep-rooted and central to the human condition.

The concept of pleasure has also been valued and treated as a defining aspect of the garden in a contemporary context. Goulty (2003) defines the garden as “An area of ground designed or laid out primarily to be used for pleasure, where the growing of plants is, or was, an important element” (xiv). Some present the importance of pleasure as an inseparable element of the garden, in a more direct manner. Garret (1978) offers a definition of the ‘pleasure garden’ as “a privately owned (as opposed to governmentally owned) ornamental ground or piece of land open to the public as a resort or amusement area and operated as a business” (i). This definition indicates that pleasure gained in a garden can probably be classified into two major strands: social and private. Since the former is mainly gained when a garden is opened for others, it will be explored in depth within this thesis in the section on the history of garden openings. In the meantime, I will briefly cover the perception of privacy in gardens.

One of the ways to experience the sense of privacy in a garden would be physical remoteness. For example, in early modern Italy, upper class people commonly owned villas outside cities. Puppi (1972) describes villa gardens in Veneto, a north-eastern region in Italy, as “the true residence of the gentleman” (87). Similarly, Gorse (1983) emphasises the association between the retreats of people of nobility and their ownership of villa gardens in Genoa (Genova) in the mid-17th century. Leon Battista Alberti (1946), who was an Italian poet and philosopher, provides more concrete accounts for those villas, stating “In the villa you can escape the clamour, the tumult, the worldly storms of the piazza and the palace. In the villa you can hide yourself in order to avoid seeing the great quantity of wicked mankind” (309; translated by Kinnard, 1986: 1). That is to say, for members of the nobility, their villas symbolised their escape from the noise of cities. By locating gardens in rural or peripheral areas, such privileged people devoted themselves to this tranquil atmosphere.

It was probably not only the noise of cities from which such nobles escaped, but also others' gaze that they intended to avoid. Corbin (2009), in his historical work on French leisure in the early 20th century, describes how gardens were used as settings where they could boisterously laugh and sing songs without minding relatives' eyes and rumours spread in towns. This description indicates that it is careless to assume that people in those days were fond of socialising in the gardens no matter whom they socialised with. This point leads us to some further exploration into relationships between multiple human agents present in the gardens - in other words, the social aspects of garden.

2.2.5. Gardens as social construction

Connell (2002) also considers gardens as “socially constructed environments” (26). Whilst this expression certainly has an element of truth, it has a quite broad connotation because it is not clear which aspect of the social dimension she presupposed. The social meanings that have emerged in the history of garden vary. If one approaches them in accordance with semantic connections, the starting point would be socialising in the gardens. As indicated in the last subsection, gardens have been used as a place in which to spend pleasurable time. The exploration of the pleasure aspect indicated the necessity to consider with whom one would socialise in a garden. Unless we examine the gardens that are publicly owned, the socialising in the gardens differentiates the hosts from the guests. Everson (1996) explains that in medieval societies the landscape was designed in order to aesthetically satisfy visitors; exemplified by Boadiam Castle in East Sussex where a number of ponds were made and positioned along the main approach to the castle. The implication from this example is that gardeners are not necessarily driven by self-satisfaction. It is therefore important to consider for whom humans transform natural settings and turn them into gardens, and how the spirit of hospitality is visually presented in design features of gardens.

Not surprisingly, the social aspect of gardens has been studied in its relation to class distinction. In investigating gardens owned by members of the nobility, it might be useful to differentiate the nobles from non-nobles. In modern France, Jean-Jacques

Rousseau was an influential advocate of landscape gardens. According to Darnall (1983), by the 1850s the irregular landscape garden was rationalised by the necessity to enhance the public welfare of the people living in urban areas. The Marquis Rene-Louis de Girardin, who created the first French landscape garden at Ermenonville, was a wealthy amateur garden architect and a patron of Rousseau (Wiebenson, 1978). Imbued with Rousseau's belief, Girardin aimed to achieve social and cultural reformation (Akkerman, 2002; Taylor-Leduc, 1999; Wiebenson, 1978). As Akkerman (2002) points out, Rousseau's belief was associated with Auguste Comte's notion of altruism. Abercrombie (2004) claims that the origin of altruism can be observed in the obligated gift-giving culture in primitive societies. Even if no sanction applies to defaulters, there might be a pervasive sense of expected social obligation to be a giver. Returning to the episode of Rousseau and Girardin, the important point was that they were able to take actions to increase the public well-being and bring advantages to the general public. What they did under their privileged circumstances might have been an embodiment of 'noblesse oblige', and, ultimately, their self-perception as the socially privileged were represented in their own gardens.

The social aspect of gardens also reflects men's or women's gender roles in society. Augspach (2004) emphasises womanhood in the medieval castle gardens, explaining that drawings in those days commonly depict women in walled gardens, and visually distinguish the male's role as the protector from the female's status as the protected. Amherst (2013) illustrates the difficulty of protecting medieval castle gardens as a sanctuary, by quoting Jordan Fantosme, an Anglo-Norman chronicler who recorded the wars between Henry II of England, his son Henry the Young King and William I of Scotland:

They did not lose within, I assure you I do not lie,
As much as amounted to a silver denier.
But they lost their fields, with all their corn
[AND] their gardens [were] ravaged by those bad people,
And he who could not do any more injury took into his head
To bark the apple trees; - it was bad vengeance. (Fantosme, 1840: 77)

The description of the destroyed garden in the extract from the chronicle illustrates that the protectors failed to fulfil their duties. Such a distinction between males as the protector and females as the protected may not apply to the contemporary context of gardens, but gendered power relationships in gardens are certainly re-generated. According to Bhatti and Church (2000), women's presence and men's absence in the garden are now likely to represent the former's confirmed status as the home-maker. The perception of gender in gardens may be different now from the past, but the gendered meaning is certainly one of the ways to consider the social dimension of gardens.

I have provided above three contexts in which the social aspect of gardens are exemplified. The design feature of Boadium Castle was introduced to explain how the spirit of hospitality was visually represented in its garden. I then recounted how the affluent garden designer the Marquis Rene-Louis de Girardin embodied the social reformation through the creation of the first French landscape garden in Ermenonville. The overview of gendered meaning of gardens was also given to indicate imbalanced power relationships between males and females. Having summarised the three aforementioned types of social construction, I would like to suggest one commonality that underlies them - the social meaning of gardens can be deepened by the same subject, that is, power. The ability to exert physical power enabled its possessor to make and position ponds where they wanted them to be positioned, and to seriously damage the medieval castle gardens. Similarly, the possession of social power enabled the possessor to spend time contemplating on philosophical discussion without feeling the necessity to use their time and energy for productive reasons. Conversely, the absence of power unavoidably let the agents without power rely on the agents with power, or freed the former to prevent themselves from being controlled by the latter. Ultimately, in examining the social dimension of the garden, the broad theme that cannot be dismissed is arguably power.

2.2.6. Power dimension

Up until this point, I have used Connell's (2002) categorisation to briefly explore meanings of gardens. Her categorisation encapsulates certain essences of gardens

being theorised through her dimensions, however, there is a limitation as I have already alluded to - power is not explicitly taken into consideration. In this subsection, I discuss four themes that are essential for deeper and more explicit discussions of power. These include capability as a common perception of power, the difference and connection between physical and social aspects of power, the importance of legitimacy and the manifestation of power. In the subsequent paragraphs, as has been done previously, historical and present examples are given to account for the importance of power in gardens.

Power will be conceptualised rigorously in the chapter on theoretical framework, but it is noteworthy here that one of the dominant perceptions of power is one's capability to control others and to accomplish his or her goals (Holmes and Stubbe, 2015). At this introductory stage, power is understood as a concept that concisely describes what one can do, and also as a theme that potentially deepens the understanding of the garden's five meanings of which I gave the overview above. In the creative dimension, humans' physical capability, or power, to transform natural resources and settings were certainly, albeit tacitly, indicated. Power can also be understood as social capability. For example, through the 17th century's cultural trend recognised as the Grand Tour, young British men were inspired by foreign landscapes to embody the concept of the picturesque in the gardens (Ross, 1998). The Grand Tourists were members of the aristocracy (Quest-Ritson, 2003; Redford, 1996), and hence were capable of doing what the general public were not able to do. When the garden is researched, the possessor and exerciser of power might not be limited to humans. The garden is, in a sense, thought to be an agent capable of influencing humans. Bhatti Church, Claremont and Stenner (2009) research the temporality of pleasure obtained from the garden, and argue that the garden has the capability to enchant humans present there and also to evoke pleasant feelings of pleasure afterwards. This implies that nature needs to be regarded as an important non-human possessor of capability to affect humans in garden-related contexts. For this reason, the consideration of power in social scientific fields has the potential to transcend human relationships

Power is ambiguous because it is observed and debated at both social and physical levels. As indicated above the difference between physical and social power, to some extent, corresponds to the difference between human-nature relations and interpersonal relationships. Even though social scientists tend to focus on social power relationships amongst different humans, the operation of physical power in human-nature relations should not be discounted in the garden-related context. Carroll (2003) mentions that different kinds of equipment, such as hoes, sickles, pruning knives or axes, which were excavated in Olynthos, are indicative of physical labour. These items substantiate the ability of human beings to cut grass or dig the ground. Those who used such items therefore were physically capable of transforming the landscape. However, seeing humans as agents that exercise physical power over nature is open to challenge because the latter can be more powerful than the former. In this light, it is re-confirmed that the idea of controlling nature has been an essential desire that rationalises the creation of gardens. Jellicoe, Jellicoe, Goode and Lancaster (1991) note that gardens have been seen historically as “oases of order, safely enclosed against the surrounding dangers of uncontrolled nature” (604). According to Turner (2005), the fountains in the colonnaded palace gardens of ancient Rome symbolised resistance to gravity. It was an abstraction of the human’s desire for dominance over the natural environment (Riley, 1990). These references further support that both humans and nature have to be considered in garden-related phenomena. Whichever one is more powerful than the other, their relation is intertwined with physical power.

In garden-related contexts where human beings and nature influence each other as a matter of course, the operation of physical power is sometimes interconnected with social aspect of power. For instance, in the *Iliad* written by Homer (translated by Pope, 1874), there is a description of security guards whose mission is to keep a palace court under surveillance over nine nights. This piece of writing is indicative of the existence of a privileged figure who is able to deploy those who are less privileged. In addition to the former’s indicated social power over the latter, it is also noteworthy that the security was physically positioned in the court - in other words, the former’s social power also had a physical influence over the latter. This Homeric

reference exemplifies the interconnection between physical and social power. There is a distinction between physical and social power, but the two types of power can be inseparably presented in garden-related contexts.

Some existing works on gardens are also indicative of the importance of legitimacy as a determiner of the quality of power. Bhatti, Church and Claremont (2014) implicate that privatism, on which I touched upon in the pleasure dimension, is closely associated with the legitimacy of physical power operations in the garden. This is because ownership enables its holder to legally transform his or her territory. This makes perfect sense where the cultivation in private terrain is compared with guerrilla gardeners who cultivate land without permission. This study suggests that the quality of power is in part determined by the territorial parameters. Nevertheless, illegitimate power exercise does not necessarily prompt the sense of guilty from the exerciser, and can rather evoke positive feelings. Gee (2012) investigates how the sense of freedom and self-determination are culturally and politically manifested, and how the distinction between the private and the public becomes blurred, in a German gardens created by Osman Kalin. Kalin was apparently the first guerrilla gardener in Germany. This study demonstrates that power illegitimately exercised beyond a territorial parameter provides its exerciser with the sense of freedom to make decisions for himself or herself. The salient implication from Gee's (2012) research is that legitimacy may need to be considered alongside the subjectivity of the parties concerned.

Another important theme regarding the power of garden enthusiasts would be the manifestation of their powerfulness. There are some works on powerful figures being obsessed to varying degrees with letting other people know how powerful they are. A notable example would be pecuniary consumption. Historically, the enthusiasm of the powerful about their gardens has often been substantiated by the amount of money they have spent. For instance, Queen Anne (1665-1714) had spent more than £25,000 on the creation of Kensington Palace by the end of the fourth year of her reign. This was despite the fact that she had to cut the royal budget due to a huge debt, which was incurred in part by William III's lavish expense on the palace

gardens (Quest-Ritson, 2003). It should be noted that their financial status deteriorated beyond their financial capacity. Another demonstration of the excessive expense on gardens is an anecdote of an ancient Greek philosopher Cicero who loaned his friends money in order to purchase eight villas outside Rome, and accounted for his loan as being “to reach a certain position” (Littlewood, 1987: 12). It is ironic that the more he spent on his garden in substantiation of his socio-economic status, the less he became financially powerful. The episode is indicative of how obsessive Cicero was about wishing to be perceived by others as powerful.

These classical episodes exemplify the powerful garden owners’ pattern of consumption that may well relate to what Thorstein Veblen (1889) coined ‘conspicuous consumption’, an ostentatious manner of spending money in order to implicitly or explicitly display socioeconomic status. In his book *The Theory of the Leisure Class*, Veblen (1889) suggests that the ethos of the leisure class stems from the pecuniary emulation in the lower stages of barbarism. Historical sources also show that this sense of emulation underlay the competitiveness amongst powerful garden owners. From an archaeological viewpoint, Evans (2000) investigates two Aztec kings’ status rivalry embodied in their royal pleasure parks. In the past British context too, Martin, Easton and McKechnie (1993) describe an extraordinary garden of a gentry family in mid-Suffolk as conspicuous display. Similarly, Charlesworth (1986) researches two 18th century landscape gardens in Yorkshire concerning family and political rivalry between the owners. According to Bhatti and Church (2001), gardens are still thought to symbolise one’s status in present British society. Even though it is doubtful whether the Veblenian understanding of leisure is still applicable to today’s society, the investigation of the perception on status display, rivalry and competitiveness amongst garden owners may discover a new dimension of the meaning of the garden.

This subsection explicitly accounted for the importance of power as the concept that was dismissed by Connell’s (2002) typology. Power, which refers to one’s capacity to achieve his or her goals, is the concept that helps us understand what one can do and how one can affect others both physically and socially. In the physical sense, it was

re-confirmed that the creation of gardens is based upon the ability to physically transform natural resources although human beings are not necessarily more powerful than nature. In terms of its social milieu, Homer's reference to the security guards in a palace court implicated the existence of a powerful figure that dominates the guards. Importantly, the Homeric description also exemplified the interconnection between physical and social power. The social power relationship can be demonstrated in physical manners, and *vice versa*, and hence both kinds of power have to be considered in garden-related leisure pursuits. I also recounted the importance of legitimacy. The example of a guerrilla garden indicated that legitimacy of power exercised in garden-related contexts may need to be examined from subjective viewpoint. Manifestation of power was also briefly considered as an important theme. Classical examples of affluent people's extraordinary expenditure on gardens were an ostentatious manifestation of their financial power. In other words, the excessive investment in gardens was thought to substantiate their social power, and also to assist the investors with the pursuance of higher social status than that of others. The competitiveness and rivalry amongst garden owners was therefore tacitly suggested as a potentially important theme.

I have now reviewed Connell's (2002) five garden dimensions: utilitarian, creative, spiritual, pleasure and gardens as social construction. Each meaning was elaborated on with different kinds of garden-related examples. In addition, the meaning of garden has been reformed by adding the dimension of power. As demonstrated so far, power possibly sheds light on nuances and subtlety that exist in the human-nature relations and in interpersonal relationships in gardens. Throughout this section, the importance of power has been both tacitly and explicitly illustrated in the context of the garden in general. I will now narrow the focus down and discuss contexts closer to the specific area of this research.

2.3. The History of British garden openings

As I have shown, geography and culture provide important areas of historical enquiry in which the development of gardens are contextualised. I would now like to address the context of British garden openings more specifically. The aim of this section is to illustrate power as the important theme in the history of British garden openings. In

the subsequent sections, I explain that from the 17th century to 19th century those who were able to open gardens to friends, acquaintances and the general public had been predominantly limited to those with significant power. The emergence of botanic gardens and the initiation of their public opening were a milestone in the popularisation of garden visiting amongst the general public. Given the establishment of the National Gardens Scheme (NGS) and Scotland's Gardens (SG) in the early 20th century, it became increasingly possible for individuals to open their private gardens to the public. It is worth remembering that 'garden opening' refers to the leisure and tourism experience in which gardens are open to people in general. Hence, it is important not to limit its connotation to 'Open Gardens' under the auspices of the NGS and SG. The Open Gardens under the two organisations should rather be clearly distinguished from other garden openings in keeping with their pioneering impact on the spread of garden openings across those who are less powerful.

2.3.1. Garden visiting/opening by those in power

The boundary between garden opening and garden visiting might be blurred because gardens cannot be visited unless they are open for visitors. Historic sources tell us that in the early history of garden visiting or opening, gardens were opened and visited mostly by those in power. The power that is the subject in this subsection is social power, and hence the intended connotation of 'those in power' is members of the aristocracy or nobility³ rather than those whose physical strength is greater than that of others. Opening or visiting privately owned gardens is not a new leisure phenomenon. According to Batey and Lambert (1990), the earliest garden visiting dates back to Henry VIII's reign. Towner (1996) has the same view, outlining that in the early 16th century, informally visiting acquaintances was common among land-owning gentry families in Norfolk, England. The eighteenth century experienced an increasing popularity of the country house or garden visit among those who were socially powerful. Gard (1989) mentions a rise of the noble's interest in seeing other

³ According to Crouch (2011, 2005 and 1992), aristocracy and nobility are clearly different. Nobility refers to a privileged group of people whose privilege is socially approved although aristocracy's counterpart is not. The difference is of fundamental importance to legitimacy of power, but historical sources cited in this subsection are almost not concerned with this point. I therefore avoid using the two terms, and label them 'socially powerful' instead.

people's gardens, by taking the diary of Sir George Lyttelton who described his visit to Powis Castle in 1755 and expressed how impressive it was.

From thence we travelled with infinite pleasure through the most pleasing country my eye ever beheld or my imagination can present, to Powis Castle, part of which was burnt down about 30 years ago, but there still remains a great house situated so finely, so nobly, that were I in the place of Lord Powis, I should forsake Okeley Park with all its beauties, and fix my seat there, as the most eligible in every respect. (quoted in Gard, 1989: 60)

Socially powerful people's view of elegance spilled over into the outside of residences as well – in other words, gardens were treated in much the same way as the interior of stately homes (Girouard, 1978). The best example of this kind is the garden at Stowe (Prakoso, 2004). Inspired by the works of leading landscape garden designers George London and Henry Wise, the garden was designed by Charles Bridgeman and John Vanburgh after 1710 (Turner, 2005). According to Gibbon (1977), in 1711, Viscount Cobham, who is also known as Richard Temple, inherited the property from his father Sir Richard, and in 1718, he enlarged the property. Gibbon further points out that there were pavilions which were constructed as entrance lodges for visitors to the garden, which implies that the garden was designed to satisfy the visitors, as well as the owners. In general, the garden at Stowe is widely known as an early example of the landscape garden. It is also worth noting that the garden at Stowe was an early example of garden openings.

In the modern period, some privately owned estates were also opened to the public. Gifford, McWilliam and Walker (1984) document that as early as the mid sixteenth century, pleasure villas in Edinburgh were visited by a number of people. Accordingly, the owners began to realise the necessity of managing their places when they are open for visitors. As Connell (2005) noted, the ticket system for admission to historic houses and gardens was first practised in the late 19th century. Mandler (1997) also mentions that charges for admission and regulations imposed on visitors emerged from the 1880s.

Opening private estates and gardens sometimes faced the necessity of control over visitors. Mandler (1997) explains the difficulty dealing with large crowds, quoting the statement of a gardener who worked at Enville Hall, which was the estate belonging to Lord Stamford in Staffordshire.

I place a man at the entrance and he admits all who come. We do not allow any bottles or baskets to be taken in the grounds. They can be left at the gate. All parties are requested not to walk on the grass. I have a few men about the grounds just to see that parties are behaving themselves... We do not allow any pic-nics or any games to be carried on inside the grounds only to walk quietly round. (quoted in Mandler 1997: 198)

The reference to men placed at the entrance and other spots where needed illustrates that the gardener and the owner of Enville Hall faced a necessity to control ill-mannered visitors. Similarly, a comment made by a gardener of Belvoir Castle in Leicestershire describes the owner's unwelcoming attitude towards visitors more vividly.

The increased facilities offered by Railways bring a great invasion of visitors and I am sorry to say that no regulations exist to meet such circumstances... Should the Duke take up his residence at the Castle in the summer time he would find it annoying to have people all over the place. (quoted in Mandler 1997: 198)

The gardener decided to tighten up the regulation in order to reduce the number of visitors to the garden, which involved banning school parties from entering (Mandler, 1997). Thus, opening private estates to the public commonly held a risk that visitors might disturb the owners' properties and gardens. It is noteworthy that despite their socially powerful status, they were not always capable of disciplining the visitors and of making them obey the rules. The owners' power was valid only in domestic territories. Aforementioned problems resulted from letting people from outside their territories enter their private areas. In other words, the powerful garden owners did not possess sufficient power over the visitors. The above quotes suggest that it is crucial to clarify who has power over whom.

The contemporary owners of country houses and gardens have also encountered similar obstacles that could discourage them from opening their private estates to the public. For instance, it is doubtful whether it is possible to cover or offset the expenditure of maintenance for the historic country houses or gardens by opening them to the public (Connell, 2005). Bellchambers (1979) conducted a survey of Scottish historic gardens open to the public and revealed that 20% of the gardens did not open to the public, despite their apparent potentiality, and suggested three reasons for this. The first reason is taxation: gardens classified as commercial enterprises could not gain any tax advantages. The second is the possibility of owners' privacy being violated: opening private places to the public is consequently allowing visitors to see the owners' ways of living. The third reason is the physical damage caused by visitors: unsympathetic public access can ruin the character of estates and gardens. Moreover, as Littlejohn and Littlejohn (1997) note, opening to the public may allow criminals, such as burglars, to more easily break into one's home, or strangers to violate owners' privacy. For these reasons, it should be kept in mind that not all garden owners are entirely happy to open their gardens to the public.

Historical sources and studies mentioned above question why garden owners open their spaces to the public despite such inconveniences. Connell (2005) construes public openings of country houses and gardens owned by wealthy people in the 18th and 19th centuries as being a social obligation. This kind of sense of obligation, however, does not explain everything about the rationale behind today's garden openings. Littlejohn and Littlejohn (1997) explain that the present owners of English country houses open, or are obliged to open, their properties including gardens to the public because they receive a grant or funding from the government. In other words, in some cases there are financial incentives for garden owners to open their garden to the public. It is yet unclear whether this is the case in the context of Scottish Open Gardens, but it is perhaps reasonable to anticipate similar kinds of practical driving forces behind the engagement in Open Gardens.

Whilst there is an element of truth in the statement that originally British garden openings were predominantly conducted by those in power, the sources referred to

above shed light on the subtlety in their power. The example of managing visitors showed the owners' lack of sufficient ability to control visitors. The implication from this example is that power is valid in a limited realm, and is often insufficient to deploy or control outsiders. I also explained that garden openings would not always be beneficial for garden owners, and might rather cause the deterioration of financial power, burglary or violation of privacy. Despite these potential risks, owners of historic gardens opened them to the public for different reasons. Nowadays some ownerships of country or historic houses and gardens have been transferred to conservation organisations such as the National Trust (Lambert and Lovie, 2006). Universities have also played an important role in the conservation of historic gardens. For instance, Wytham Abbey Estate in Oxford was bought by the Oxford University Chest in 1958, and the Tabley House Estate has been owned by the University of Manchester since 1976 (Clemenson, 1982). This means that the general public's demand to visit such gardens is in part not satisfied by powerful individuals in today's Britain. In the next subsection, I will outline the period in which such a role began to be played by the public bodies, namely botanic gardens.

2.3.2. Botanic gardens

In this subsection, I present historical sources to show how the general public's demand to visit gardens came to be met by using the example of the development of British botanic gardens. Whilst the gardens were established for educational purposes, they have also been widely recognised as a recreational resource or asset that can be used and shared beyond educational usages. This recreational aspect of botanic gardens is illustrated by an overview of how the Royal Botanic Gardens Edinburgh and the Royal Botanic Gardens Kew were established and developed. The rationale behind the selection of these two gardens as examples is that the impact of the general public's collective power on the initiation of opening is well exemplified in their history.

The foundation of the Royal Botanic Garden of Edinburgh in 1670 was an important event in the history of gardens in Scotland because it was an early example of garden visiting and opening. It was the first botanic garden in Scotland, and the second in Britain, after the Oxford Botanic garden in 1620, and was followed by Cambridge in

1726. Sir Robert Sibbald and his friend and cousin, Dr Andrew Balfour (later ‘Sir’) are known as botanists who significantly contributed to the foundation of the Edinburgh Physic Garden that would later become the Royal Botanic Garden of Edinburgh (Rohl, 2011). According to James (2005), Sir Robert brought back the idea of establishing a physic garden from Leiden, Amsterdam and Paris where he received his medical education. Haldane (1934) notes that Dr Balfour transferred his own rare plants to Edinburgh, and established the garden in co-operation with Sir Robert. According to the official website of the garden (accessed on 28th August 2016), it was inaugurated as a herb garden to cultivate medicinal plants. Hill (1915) supplies further information that the garden was created in order to provide practitioners with accurate knowledge of botanic and horticultural matters. In short, the garden was originally established for educational purposes.

In addition to its educational usage, the Royal Botanic Garden of Edinburgh also had recreational orientation in its early history (Garrod, Pickering and Willis, 1993), which of course was of significance to the development of garden opening and visiting in Britain. Avery (1957) describes botanic gardens as “a park without a place to play” (268). Even though there are usually no slides or swings in botanic gardens, they can function as a recreational setting where the general public can go for a walk. In terms of the public availability of the Royal Botanic Garden of Edinburgh, it is not certain whether it has been open to the public since its foundation in 1670. In a chronicle titled *The Royal Botanic Garden Edinburgh 1670-1970*, Fletcher and Brown (1970) introduce a letter written in 1810 by Daniel Rutherford who was a professor of Medicine and Botany at the University of Edinburgh and the keeper of the garden. It was sent to Sir Joseph Banks, who was the President of the Royal Society and Director of the Botanic Gardens at Kew, in order to ask Sir Joseph to introduce a new principal gardener. In the letter, Rutherford suggested that the emoluments are £40 per year and gratuities may be offered by visitors to the garden. It is therefore deduced that by the time the letter was sent, there had already been visitors to the garden. The tie between the garden and its visitors who appreciated the garden’s recreational aspect gradually became stronger. Fletcher and Brown (1970) record in detail the 1863 controversy surrounding opening days and times. There was

a mass demand for public openings on Sunday afternoons for working men who did not have enough time to visit the garden during weekdays. On the contrary, and not surprisingly, devout Christians disagreed with public openings on the Sabbath. The Select Committee of the House of Commons viewed that recreational settings should be open on Sunday afternoons, which consequently prompted the initiation of the botanic garden's Sunday afternoon openings.

The recreational orientation has also been prominent in the Royal Botanic Garden at Kew since its early history. Originally, the Kew Gardens were owned by the Capel family, and then, around 1730, the family agreed to lease the garden and its estate Kew House to Prince Frederik, the Prince of Wales, who admired the beauty of the garden and began to develop the pleasure ground (Hepper, 1982). After the death of the Prince of Wales in 1751, the development was further carried out by his widow Princess Augusta, the Princess Dowager of Wales, in co-operation with her head gardener John Dillman. Thus the first botanic garden, which was the direct predecessor of today's Kew Garden, was established in 1759 (Desmond, 1998). According to Hooker (2013), the considerable change in the Kew Garden was completed around 1840, and the garden began to be rendered available for the general public. William Aiton, who had been in charge of the scientific development of Kew Gardens, retired in 1840, thus the control of the garden was transferred to the Commissioners of Woods and Forests (Bower, 1941). This was the official acquisition of the garden by the British Government.

Demands for public openings and the recreational use of the Royal Botanic Gardens of Kew became considerable to such an extent that the Kew Gardens encountered a similar public agitation to that of the Royal Botanic gardens of Edinburgh. In 1877, the Kew Gardens Public Rights Association was established in order to propose the earlier daily opening of the gardens (Desmond, 1975). A local clergyman introduced an instance where a majority of people expected to enter the garden on the morning of a Bank Holiday but the garden was closed (Desmond, 1972). It is worthy of note that contrary to the case of Edinburgh where the early opening was frowned upon by the Christian community, the garden opening seem to be welcomed and encouraged

by the English clergymen. Despite this widely accepted demand for a garden visit, amendments made to the opening hours were limited. The House of Commons was aware of this issue and yielded a little, but only allowed the Kew Gardens to be opened to the public at 10 o'clock on all Bank Holidays (Desmond, 1975). The early history of the Kew Gardens reflects, along the lines of its counterpart of Edinburgh, the citizens' resistance to authoritative decision-making.

Summarising the opening of the two well-known botanic gardens in Edinburgh and Kew, the necessity for recreational use of public gardens arose and became approved by both authoritative figures and the general public. The 19th century experienced movements to increase the gardens accessibility to the general public. Even though the initiation of such a movement might have been a contribution made by upper class people, we have seen the general public's increasing interest in visiting gardens. The general public are usually less socially powerful than members of the aristocracy or nobility. However, the sources I presented above showed that they were influential in persuading the botanic gardens to be open on Sundays and Bank Holidays when they had time to visit them. The historical developments of the Botanic gardens well exemplified how the general public's collective power might have strengthened the recreational aspect of both gardens. In the contemporary period, this demand was satisfied partly by the development of two organisations that have run Open Gardens, which we will discover in the subsequent subsections.

2.3.3. The history of the National Gardens Scheme

In this subsection, I give an outline of how the NGS has developed. In outlining its history, I will jointly use several research works on it. Aida (2002) provides a comprehensive account of the development of NGS in his Japanese PhD thesis, and informs me about what the milestones in its history were. This is therefore utilised to pick up on important events in the development of NGS and also to effectively summarise its long history. Detailed descriptions of each historical event are mostly drawn from historic sources relevant to the development of NGS, such as the minutes of meetings that have been archived at the Wellcome Library, London. Again, Aida's (2002) PhD thesis is of fundamental importance to this subsection because he also consults the minutes of NGS meetings and clearly states where they are available.

Moreover, by consulting the documents archived at Wellcome Library by myself, I also managed to rigorously examine the accuracy of accounts in Aida's thesis written in Japanese and also of other works on the history of NGS and SG. Detailed explanation of documentary analysis will be provided in the chapter on research method.

The primary aim of this subsection is to describe how the demand to visit private gardens was gradually met by those with little power as well as those with considerable power. To begin with, it is necessary to review how the Queen's Nursing Institute (QNI) started because the NGS used to be a part of QNI. In 1859, a Liverpool businessman William Rathbone employed a nurse, Mary Robinson, to take care of his wife who was suffering from a long illness (Aida, 2002). Being concerned about the situation of poor people who were unable to employ a nurse in times of sickness, Rathbone persuaded the nurse he had employed to give nursing care where needed (Isobel, 1981). Facing difficulty in going out and providing nursing care in local areas, the nurse consulted Florence Nightingale (Isobel, 1981), and on her advice, in 1862, Rathbone established a nurse training school attached to Liverpool Royal Infirmary (Edmonstone, 2006). In 1887, Queen Victoria allocated £70,000 from her Golden Jubilee gift fund, making the establishment of the Queen's Nurses Training Homes possible (Isobel, 1981). The first home was built in Edinburgh in 1889, and then re-named 'Queen Victoria's Jubilee Institute for Nurses'. The establishment of this institute turned district nursing into an accepted and integral part of British life (Howse, 2007, 2006).

Queen Alexandra succeeded Queen Victoria as the president of the above-mentioned Institute. After the death of Queen Alexandra in 1925, the National Memorial to her was established within the Institute in order to raise money for the pensions of the nurses trained by the Queen Victoria's Jubilee Institute for Queen's Nurses (Aida, 2002). It was discussed at a meeting of QNI held on 12th July 1927 that the Institute should establish a permanent scheme for opening gardens in order to allocate money, which could be beneficial for both towns and the County Nursing Associations (QNI, 1927a). The idea of opening gardens to compensate for the financial shortage

stemmed from the fact that Lady Georgina Mure and Mrs Frank Stobart had opened their gardens in the past and had made a significant profit. At the same meeting, it was also recorded that these two people “should form the sub-committee and... should have power to co-opt additional members” (QNI, 1927a: 41).

The Garden Scheme Sub-Committee was established within QNI in October of 1927. According to Aida (2002), the first guidebook *June Garden Month* included 609 gardens open to the public, and the total of £8,191 was raised for charity. It is documented in a report of a meeting on 21st July 1927 that the members of the Sub-Committee considered a letter, signed by the Duke of Portland, to thank the garden owners who had opened their gardens in that year (QNI, 1927b). Importantly, as Aida (2002) notes, the gardens opened to the public for this first time were all owned by members of the upper classes. The establishment of NGS was a considerable contribution made by those who were socially powerful. Sources presented so far show that district nursing is inextricably intertwined with the establishment of the NGS, and the idea of financially assisting retired District Nurses further drove the development of the Open Gardens. In other words, the idea underlying the early history of the NGS was to support those who were less socially powerful.

The historical development of Open Gardens under the NGS cannot be explained in detail without considering collaborations with other charitable bodies. For example, its co-operation with nurseries cannot be discounted. In 1938, the Garden Scheme Sub-Committee decided to include nursery gardens (QNI, 1938). It is documented in the minute of the meeting held on the 10th December in 1953 that several nursery gardens had been opened on behalf of the committee (QNI, 1953b). The participation of nursery gardens must not be discounted, in keeping with the fact that nowadays plant sales are very common in Open Gardens under the NGS. It is also important to consider the collaboration with Women’s Voluntary Services (WVS). At a conference held in 1946, the committee discussed the serving of tea, sales of flowers and vegetable stalls as means of increasing the income and the amount raised for charity (QNI, 1946). In 1952, the Gardens Committee requested the WVS to provide some advice regarding provisions of teas at Open Gardens (QNI, 1952). At a Sub-

Committee meeting held on 8th October 1953, it was reported that in Leicestershire tea servings were successfully carried out with WVS (QNI, 1953a). Today the serving of tea has been generally accepted as one of the most common visitor attractions. Connell (2005) reports that refreshments were sold in the majority of the British garden openings to which her survey was distributed (76.8%). Considering the popularity of serving refreshments in today's Open Gardens, the initiation of co-operation with WVS was an important milestone in the history of the NGS.

For the NGS, it was also important to begin to build the partnership with the National Trust. On 5th October 1948, a special meeting was held and the Garden Scheme Sub-Committee officially initiated the co-operation with the National Trust (QNI, 1948). Interestingly, it was the general public who proposed this relationship rather than the scheme or the trust. According to the minutes of that meeting, the chairman of the trust suggested the amalgamation with the committee, in keeping with the fact that the trust had received a large number of offers from owners of gardens to open their gardens for the National Trust Gardens Fund, which was founded for garden conservation. As explained above, the garden opening of NGS started in order to compensate for the deficiency in pensions for the nurses. Therefore, this was the first time that the NGS organised garden opening for the preservation of historic gardens, which was a different purpose from the original aim.

An important milestone in the historical development of the NGS is its independence from QNI. The National Health Service was officially launched in 1948 and it took over the responsibility for paying pensions to retired nurses (Aida, 2002). In 1973, the Queen Victoria's Jubilee Institute for Nurses changed its name to the name used today, the Queen's Nursing Institute. In 1980, the Garden Scheme Sub-Committee of the Institute became independent and a registered charitable organisation - the National Gardens Scheme (QNI, 1980). Even though there were approximately 1450 gardens open for the organisation around the point of independence (NGS, 1980), the number of gardens dramatically increased to more than 2500 by 1990 (NGS, 1990), 3500 by 2000 (NGS, 2000), to more than 3,700 today (Benfield, 2013). The

implication from these figures is that the independence from QNI was a turning point in the popularisation of the Open Gardens under the NGS.

Another important event of 1980 was the initiation of a new feature of donations in which additional charities could be nominated by garden owners. It is reasonable to deduce a causal relationship between the initiation of this new system and the increase in the amount of donation raised for charity, as its annual sum dramatically increased from approximately £ 140,000 in 1979 (QNI, 1979) to £250,000 in 1980 (Aida, 2002). Additional charities are nominated by garden openers “for the relief of poverty, religion, education or other purposes beneficial to the community” (NGS, 2000: 13). Today, in addition to these charities of openers’ choice, there are also registered beneficiaries such as the QNI, the National Trust, Macmillan Cancer Support, Hospice UK, Careers Trust, Perennial and Marie Curie Cancer Care (NGS, 2015a). Moreover, the NGS invites a different ‘guest charity’ every year. For example, Parkinson’s UK was nominated in 2014 and 2015 and has been given donations. The sum of funds distributed to these beneficiaries in 2015 was £2,700,000 (NGS, 2015b).

With respect to the criteria of today’s garden openings, the NGS has not declared any details. However, Joe Swift, who was the previous chairman of NGS, remarks that the size of a garden is not critical (NGS, 2013), which supports the view of some garden openers. Steve Bustin (2011), an amateur gardener opening his garden for NGS, has commented in a local news magazine that “it doesn’t matter if your garden is the size of a postage stamp or it doesn’t rival Versailles in the beauty stakes” (1). It can be deduced, from the historical context in which the NGS encouraged the opening of small gardens, that the size of the garden is not crucial. Connell (2005) claims that a significant aspect of the garden openings as a part of NGS is to assist new types of gardens to open to the public. Thus, NGS does not limit its criteria to a historic arena. As mentioned, nowadays more than 4,000 gardens are opened to the public, varying from historic castles or royal gardens to small private home gardens. The flexibility of the criteria may play an important role when it comes to its popularity and its long-term success.

The aforementioned various historic events are summarised and categorised into three points. First and foremost, the NGS was established by those who were socially powerful. The original purpose of its establishment was to assist those who were socially disadvantaged and unable to receive proper medical treatments. District nursing was designed to aid such less socially powerful people. Accordingly, the necessity to deal with the pension of District Nurses arose, and it was met by opening gardens to the public. Second, the NGS has collaborated with various bodies such as nurseries, the Women's Voluntary Services and the National Trust. Third, in relation to the second point, the collaborations with these organisations led to the enhancement of visitor services such as sales of plants and refreshments, and also to the diversification of gardens open to the public. Considering the fact that sales of plants and refreshments still significantly contribute to the donations raised for beneficiaries, and that a wide range of private and public gardens are open for the NGS, the partnerships with other organisations are understood as an inseparable aspect of Open Gardens. In addition, the absence of overly-strict criteria is also important because it allows not only the manicured gardens of socially powerful people but also the general public's ordinary gardens to be opened to the public. Restating the primary aim of this subsection, it is no longer only those who are socially powerful, but also those with less power that can satisfy the demand to visit gardens.

2.3.4. The history of Scotland's Gardens

This subsection offers an overview of the historical development of SG. The information provided below is based mostly on the aforementioned minutes of the Queen's Nursing Institute (QNI), the guidebooks of SG and Edmonstone's (2006) and Isobel's (1981) articles that have appeared in the guidebook. The guidebooks published in 1955, 1962, from 1967 to 1970 and after 1972 have been archived at the National Library of Scotland. Old guidebooks were also available at the head-office of SG although not all have been in perfect condition. The head-office generously allowed me to make photocopies of the guidebooks of 1951 and 1953. These sources assisted me with compiling milestones in the history of SG. Even though the history of SG is similar to the counterpart of NGS, there are also differences in the historical

development of the two organisations. In the following paragraphs, I feature both commonalities and difference between the NGS and SG.

I recounted in the last subsection that the NGS was established as a committee in the QNI in 1927 to raise money for the Queen's Nurses. Likewise, in 1931, following the success of the NGS, SG was initiated to allocate money to the Queen's Nursing Institute Scotland (Edmonstone, 2006). The original name was the 'Scotland's Gardens Scheme' (SGS). H.R.H The Duchess of York and The Countess of Minto were elected as the first president and the first chairman respectively (Isobel, 1981). According to the official website of SG (accessed on 2nd August 2015), more than 500 gardens were listed in the first guidebook. Edmonstone (2006) mentions that in the early days, most gardens opened to the public for SGS were those of privileged and affluent families, and their leisured life style with beautiful properties provided the owners with a perceived sense of public service. During World War II (1939-1945) the number of gardens which opened to the public dropped from 500 to 300 (Edmonstone, 2006). Isobel (1981) notes that some people with responsibility for the scheme began to realise the therapeutic benefits of garden opening for war-workers. For this reason, Isobel further describes, flyers advertising the Open Gardens were posted around mines and factories, and petrol was allocated for special buses to go to the Open Gardens. Given the difficult circumstance, the Open Gardens under the auspices of SGS had not yet been well diversified.

Another commonality between the NGS and SG is the partnership with other organisations. As we observed in the last subsection, SGS also established a co-operation with the National Trust. In 1952, SGS officially made the first donation to the National Trust for Scotland, which was facing a financial shortfall for the preservation of historic gardens (SGS, 1955). According to Roger (1982), the National Trust for Scotland was established in 1932, and has opened historic gardens to the public on behalf of SG., in order "to conserve and display, for the benefit of the public, the buildings and their contents and to convey, as nearly as possible, the atmosphere created by former owners" (10). In the first season of the co-operation, the National Trust for Scotland received £1,975 (SGS, 1991). In addition to the

partnership with the National Trust for Scotland, SGS also gradually expanded its registered beneficiaries. In 1961, SGS allocated money to the Gardener's Royal Benevolent Society, which is now called Perennial, and the Royal Gardener's Orphan Fund (SGS, 1962). In 2008, Maggie's Cancer Caring Centres was also newly appointed as a registered beneficiary (SGS, 2009). In 2012, the SGS changed its name to the current one 'Scotland's Gardens' (SG, 2012b). In 2014, 388 gardens were listed in the guidebook and 226 different charities selected by garden owners were supported, as well as the four main beneficiaries (SG, 2014).

Whilst the historical development of SG is analogous to its counterpart of the NGS, it is not logical to draw the conclusion that SG has also experienced the steady popularisation of its Open Gardens. This is because, as shown above, the number of gardens open for the organisation has not changed very much since its establishment in 1931. However, the amount of annual donations raised for charities has significantly increased. The sum of donations was a mere £1000 in the first year (SGS, 1995), but increased to over £14,000 in 1960, over £24,000 in 1970 and over £65,000 in 1980 (Isobel, 1981). In 1982, the SGS received the British Tourist Authority Award in recognition of its contribution to British tourism (Edmonstone, 2006), and in 2013, approximately £310,000 was raised for charity (SG, 2014). As a contributing factor to the successful increase in the amount raised for charity, the split in money allocated to charities is discussed in the remainder of this subsection.

In the early 1950's, an important decision was made to enable garden owners to allocate 40% of the gross-takings to charities of their choice (SGS, 1953a). This was much earlier than the NGS that initiated additional charities nominated by garden owners in 1980. Whilst the webpage of SG suggests that this 40% allocation to charities of the owner's choice was started in 1961 (Appendix 1), this is false. A Report for the Queen's Institute Council Meeting, which was held on 30th October, 1953, clearly states that "In 1951 we agreed... of leaving a proportion of the money in the Counties for allocation... to charities of the Owner's choice" and "We rely on the good-will of the majority of the Owners to send in also the county's 40% of the money raised" (SG, 1953b: 1-2) (Appendix 2). Therefore, it is rational to describe

that the allocation of 40% of net income to charities nominated by the openers was initiated in 1951, instead of 1961. My view is supported by descriptions in guidebooks published in those days. The guidebook published in 1953 remarks that “40% from each Garden opening (less county expenses) will be allocated to any recognised charities of the owner’s choice” (SGS, 1953a: 15). The issue of 1955 also states that the garden owners are expected to nominate QNI and NTS as charities to which the 40% is given (SGS, 1955) (Appendix 3). Thus, it is clear that this allocation system was introduced prior to 1961.

This allocation system may have been influential where the amount of the donation was concerned. As noted earlier, the National Health Service was established in 1948, and took over the responsibility for District Nurses’ pensions. As a result, garden owners were no longer responsible for financially assisting the retired District Nurses. However, in the guidebook published in 1991, the Earl of Wemyss and March, who was the President of the National Trust for Scotland at the time, mentioned that the 40% system would encourage garden owners to open their gardens (SGS, 1991). Edmonstone (2006) reports that in 1961, the total number of charities selected by owners was 170. This figure has increased to 226 in 2014 (SG, 2014). The increase in the number of charities chosen by garden openers indicates that the 40% allocation system has effectively contributed to the amount raised for charity.

Thus far, I have briefly outlined the history of SG, and showed its similarity to, and difference from, the NGS. As demonstrated in the history of the NGS, SG was also initiated to cover the budget required for paying pensions to nurses educated at the Queen’s Nursing Institute Scotland. I also noted other commonalities between the two organisations; that those who opened gardens for SG in its earliest history were predominantly socially powerful people, and that SG has established co-operation with other organisations. Unlike the NGS, however, the number of visitors to Scottish Open Gardens has not changed great deal. Nevertheless, the amount of the donation that SG raises for charities every year has dramatically increased from the beginning to the present. Of course, the unit cost for entrance to gardens would presumably have increased over decades, but the increase in the number of charities

nominated by garden openers is indicative of its contribution to the amount raised for charity. In this light, the 1951 introduction of the split in money donated to charity was an important milestone in the history of SG.

To summarise this section on British garden opening, it is clear that power has been an important theme. Through the exploration of garden openings by those in power, I have raised an important question regarding the territory in which one's power legitimately influences others. The development of botanic gardens provided us with examples of how the power of the general public, who possessed less social power, could function collectively. Despite the importance of power as a theme underlying the development of British garden openings, it has not been explicitly debated in the existing studies on present garden openings. This point will be rigorously addressed in the next section.

2.4. Critical reviews of existing studies on contemporary garden openings

In this section, I critically review several existing studies on garden openings and present four reasons why further empirical research on the subject is required. Even though garden visiting has drawn much academic attention (Connell, 2005, 2004, 2002; Fox et al., 2010; Fox, 2007, 2006; Gallagher, 1983; Jashimuddin et al. 2004; Kohllepel et al., 2002; Tipples and Gibbons, 1992), there has been little empirical research into garden opening. Reporting past studies on garden opening is not straightforward as some previous studies on garden visiting also treated garden opening as a subsidiary interest and presented some information on those who are on the production side of garden opening. In this section, therefore, studies of both garden visiting and opening are reviewed and findings relevant to this research are referred to regardless of their original subject field. Before reporting findings of the previous studies and carefully identifying their limitations in the following subsections, I briefly introduce them according to country.

In terms of British garden openings, I identified three studies. As noted elsewhere, Aida (2002) researched the development of the National Gardens Scheme, and briefly reported today's Open Gardens under the NGS, such as size of gardens, the

percentage of gardens with parking space, the ratio of gardens with sales of plants or refreshments to gardens without such visitor attractions and profile of garden openers. There may have been other studies that were conducted earlier than Aida's (2002), and that were written in neither Japanese nor English, but amongst the works that I can read, this was the first attempt. Later, Connell (2005) studied the management of British garden openings and reported the results of a questionnaire survey. The survey was distributed to a total of 1223 private, public and commercial gardens in England, Scotland and Wales, and 593 usable returns were collected. Lipovská (2013) surveyed the motivations of those who opened their gardens to the public. Since her specific interest was small private gardens, respondents were randomly sampled from the Yellow Book, the official guidebook of the NGS, in which a large number of private domestic gardens are listed.

In terms of garden openings from abroad, there are a couple of studies that were undertaken in New Zealand and Australia. Given the increasing popularity of garden tourism in New Zealand, Tipples and Gibbons (1992) conducted an exploratory study that focused on six garden tours in the country. The tours aimed to raise money for school based charities. Similarly, Ryan and Bates (1995) undertook a questionnaire survey in order to investigate the motivation for opening gardens to the public. They focused on the Manawatu Rose and Garden Festival in New Zealand in which 76 private and public gardens were voluntarily opened to the public. The objectives of the festival were mainly to raise financial benefits for the local economy and to enhance community welfare. Furthermore, Kay et al. (2008) examined the applicability of leisure motivation theories to the volunteer work in non-profit organisations by investigating the Victoria region of the Australia's Open Garden Scheme as an example. To address 'how' and 'why' type questions, they conducted in-depth interviews with five kinds of volunteers: host garden owners, garden selectors, event managers, event staff and committee members.

In summary, six studies offered information relevant to garden openings. Even though these studies have significantly contributed to the establishment of the baseline understanding of contemporary garden openings, further research is required

for several reasons. In the subsequent sections, I will identify the limitations of the previous studies and gaps in the knowledge in more detail in order to pursue the possibility of further research.

2.4.1. The absence of thinking about power

First and foremost, insufficient scholarly attention has been paid to power in contemporary garden openings. In the earlier sections, I have already shown the importance of power in the garden-related context in general, and in the history of British garden openings in particular. Power ubiquitously matters in the garden-related context. The basis for the transformation of untouched natural settings into gardens is, as we have seen, the deployment of physical power. It was also recounted in the section on the dimension of power that, gardens of those who were socially powerful symbolised their socio-economic status through the creation of, or the excessive expenditure on, gardens. In addition to this historical context, there is also an implication from previous studies that power is of significance to Open Gardens. Ryan and Bates (1995) found that the item ‘To show others what can be achieved’ significantly increased from the pre-opening to post-opening (65). Today what garden owners display to others might not simply be socio-economic achievements. Murphy (2016) points out that the traditional understanding of ‘conspicuous consumption’, which originates from Veblen (1889), is outdated and inadequate for explaining the consumption patterns of contemporary elites because they would rather ridicule such an ostentatious display of their socio-economic status in material manners. Inspired by other theorists such as Bourdieu, Murphy (ibid) indicates a paradox that today’s elites would rather refrain from explicitly signalling their highbrow cultural taste although they are socio-economically successful too. The investigation of how, and what kind of power, is signalled through garden openings may be a possible orientation for further research.

In Open Gardens run by SG in which different kinds of people contribute to their production, different kinds of power relationships are expected to exist amongst them. The term ‘power relationship’ does not solely connote one’s domination over others. Many nuances and some subtlety may be uncovered by investigating power conflicts, negotiation, validity of one’s control over others and other themes relevant to power.

The significant gap in knowledge therefore lies in power operations in contemporary garden openings.

2.4.2. Absence of critical views

Another problematic point with respect to the existing studies, especially in relation to the motivation of opening, is the tendency to focus on positive aspects of garden openings. Charity (Connell, 2005; Lipovská, 2013; Tipples and Gibbons, 1992), sharing the garden with others or pleasure obtained from their gardens with others (Connell, 2005; Lipovská, 2013; Ryan and Bates, 1995) and socialising (Lipovská, 2013; Ryan and Bates, 1995) were identified as major motivations. From these findings, the implication is that garden openers are philanthropic and generous, and that Open Gardens provide visitors with a social leisure pursuit. However, leisure can be an unpleasant experience (Beggan and Pruit, 2014). Stebbins (2000) offers an insightful suggestion that despite its connotation of freedom, leisure is sometimes obligatory and disagreeable. For example, women's subordination and devotion have been established at Christmas where they have to organise leisure activities such as preparing gifts, looking after children, expressing generosity to family and feeding them (Vachhani and Pullen, 2014). In the context of garden openings too, inequalities and demotivation may be observed, which can be found by revisiting some pre-identified motivations for opening the garden to the public.

It is not surprising that sharing the garden with others, or pleasure obtained from sharing their gardens with others, has been reported by previous studies as one of the commonly-identified motivations (Connell, 2005; Lipovská, 2013; Ryan and Bates, 1995). This is because by letting other people into their private gardens, their owners temporarily allows the visitors to use their gardens which are assets legally belonging to the owners. However, as noted in 2.3.1, sharing private gardens with strangers may cause physical damage to the gardens, violation of privacy or intrusion. Thus, the act of allowing visitors to visit one's private gardens can internalise risks of security issues. There is also a possibility that garden openers may encounter inconveniences when interacting with visitors. Whereas the existing studies reported socialising as a commonly-answered motivating factor (Lipovská, 2013; Ryan and Bates, 1995), they have not clarified with whom garden openers would like to

socialise. Hence, there might be specific types of people with whom openers are not pleased to converse or share their gardens with. If this is the case, such unpleasantness must demotivate garden owners to open.

The necessity of a critical view is further highlighted when considering the fact that Open Gardens are co-produced by garden openers, their helpers, volunteers and the staff of SG. Even though garden openers produce their public open days in co-operation with their associates, are they all willing to? Is there any power exercised against someone's will? It is therefore necessary not to idealise or romanticise the production of Open Gardens.

2.4.3. Absence of understanding of all parties concerned

Apart from the owners' motivations for opening, the management of garden openings was also investigated by Connell (2005). Connell offered descriptions of gardens by owners, garden ownership, reasons for opening and services with which owners provide visitors. Whilst her questionnaire study helps us understand more about garden owners, it does not comprehensively shed light on the co-production of Open Gardens. This is because it is often not only garden owners that are responsible for, or are engaging in, the management of gardens. Other kinds of people who assist the owners with opening should also be profiled and examined. Connell (2002) herself comments that the operation of the NGS, which is equivalent to SG, is a fruitful orientation for further research. As noted above, Kay et al. (2008) investigated the motivation of five kinds of volunteers involved in the Victoria region of Australia's Open Garden Scheme, but reported their motivations together. Considering the difference in roles played, it is questionable whether the perspective of garden owners can be treated along the same lines as the perspective of those who support them. In order to holistically illuminate how Open Gardens are collaboratively run by different people, it is crucial to pay sufficient attention to all kinds of parties on the production side of Open Gardens, and also to carefully describe what views are held by whom.

2.4.4. Absence of understanding of Scottish Open Gardens

In terms of the research location, there has been no attempt to investigate Open Gardens under the auspices of SG. Studies conducted by Aida (2002) and Lipovská's (2013) were aimed at the NGS that runs Open Gardens in England and Wales. Connell (2005) conducted a nation-wide survey, and gathered data from England, Scotland and Wales. However, Connell reported her data collectively, and did not clarify which findings apply to which regions. Thus, no specific research relating only to Scottish Open Gardens has been undertaken. Notwithstanding the fact that the NGS and SG are essentially similar, there is a distinct difference in scale. The NGS holds nearly ten times the number of gardens than its Scottish counterpart. In addition, as described in the subsections on the history of the two bodies, SG began to allow garden openers to choose additional charities much earlier than the NGS. These differences may lead to unique characteristics of Scottish Open Gardens and this possibility is worth investigating.

2.5. Chapter summary and statement of finalised research question

This chapter laid the foundations for this research by reviewing the literature on gardens. I initially considered Connell's (2002) five dimensions of gardens: utilitarian, creative, pleasure, spiritual and social construction. To this, I added the dimension of power, and supported this with practical accounts of power presentation in the history of gardens. Moreover, I recounted the history of British garden openings. Gardens used to be opened and visited predominantly by those in power in the early modern period, whereas the popularisation of garden visiting became notable in the late modernity when botanic gardens began to be opened to the public. In the contemporary period, the NGS and SG were founded in 1927 and 1931 respectively. Since then, the number of Open Gardens and the amount of donation raised for charities has increased, which also indicates the popularisation of garden opening.

Next, I provided a critical review of six empirical studies on contemporary garden openings. In order to identify gaps in knowledge and orientation for further research, I raised four points. First, despite the fact that the importance of power as a theme that matters in various garden-related fields has already been observed and confirmed

in the literature, it has not been explicitly addressed in the context of Open Gardens. Second, the existing studies reported only positive aspects of garden openings, and therefore Open Gardens may need to be more critically examined without romanticising or idealising them. Third, most of the existing studies focused solely upon garden owners who open their gardens to the public, and did not clarify the role and view of each party concerned and how they contribute to the production of Open Gardens. Finally, there has been no inquiry to date into Open Gardens under SG.

The huge body of widely differing literature on gardens showed great complexities surrounding power that has operated in garden-related contexts. It is fundamentally important to pay attention to the difference between physical power and social power. Gardens are quasi-natural settings where the modification or transformation of natural resources manifests, as a matter of course, humans' physical power over nature (Mausner, 1996). Interpersonal relationships between humans involved in gardens, such as garden owners and manual labourers who transformed natural resources by order of the garden owner, manifest imbalanced distributions of social power. The sources given in this chapter also illustrated that power and its meanings may not remain consistent in garden-related contexts. The fact that the public opening of botanic gardens developed in order to satisfy the request of fatigued workers, indicated that protest is a model of power enactment (Desmond, 1972; Fletcher and Brown, 1970). Similarly, prominent examples of guerrilla gardening demonstrated that power functions not only as domination over others, but also as resistance against existing regimes and norms (Reynold, 2014; Tracey, 2013). Considering the guerrilla gardeners' unpermitted transformation of spaces, legitimacy was suggested as a key point that potentially deepens the discussion of power in garden-related leisure pursuits. The review of the literature was demonstrative of a wide variety of meanings of power.

The existing sources consulted above also indicated that the meaning of garden varies according to human perceptions. Gardening can manifest human domination over nature (Janick, 2014; Riley, 1990), but early examples of the English landscape garden indicated that such physical power deployment was an embodiment of

humans' appreciation of natural beauty (Hadfield, 1979; Hunt and Willis, 1988; Laird, 1999). I also recounted some spiritual aspects of gardens in the medieval period, and the connection between the selection of specific plants and the symbolic power those selected plants are believed to possess (Head and Atchison; 2009). It is debatable, however, whether all believe in such supernatural power ascribed to plants. The implication from this is that the existence of some kinds of power can be controversial. Similarly, people may have different perceptions of the usage of power. The social reformation that some prominent garden architects tried to achieve illustrated their altruistic attitudes towards the garden as a leisure resource (Akkerman 2002; Taylor-Leduc 1999; Wiebenson 1978). On the contrary, the use of the garden as a status indicator or status signal showed that it can be deployed to satisfy one's personal purpose (Charlesworth, 1986; Evans, 2000; Littlewood, 1987; Martin, Easton and McKechnie, 1993). This contrast between an altruistic and self-centred use of gardens illustrates that human perceptions are a crucial determiner of the usage of gardens.

All things considered, the meaning of gardens is determined by human perceptions of power that matters and is enacted in the gardens. According to Anderson, John and Keltner (2012), power is a subjective and psychological state of human beings and their perceptions of their own ability to influence others. I believe that the understanding of power of the co-producers of Scottish Open Gardens can be deepened by addressing the research question articulated below.

How does power, which differs in meaning according to human perception, operate in the production of Scottish Open Gardens?

I have now carefully rationalised the primary research question by reviewing the meaning of the garden and the history of different garden openings. This study arrived at this research question due to the underlying significance of the broad theme of power. The next chapter will look more closely at the subject of power itself.

Chapter 3: Discourses on Power and Theoretical Framework

3.1. Introduction

In the last chapter, great emphasis was deliberately laid on the importance of power as the theme that is closely associated with the garden-related context in general and with garden openings in particular. In this chapter, the discussion of power itself will be developed. The chapter has two sections. In the first section, I will provide an overview of existing conventional discourses on power, and categorise these according to theorists of power. The theorists are also categorised according to their nationalities to some extent. This is because power has traditionally been theorised and conceptualised in the contexts of social, political and economic sciences, and social, political and economic circumstances under which the thinkers built their own theories of power have influenced the ways in which they have built the theories. I will therefore briefly mention historical backgrounds of their times where appropriate. The chapter will also consider the Actor-Network-Theory (ANT). It is a relatively newly emerging ‘power school’ that examines both humans and non-humans through the same analytical lenses. Unlike the traditional discourses on power, ANT will indicate more appropriate ways to investigate power that operates in gardens whereby human being encounter the natural world and different kinds of non-human factors as a matter of course.

In the latter part of this chapter, I will introduce Jonathan Hearn’s (2012) conceptualisation of power. This will be used as the theoretical framework with which my raw data are contextualised. One of the reasons for using it is that Hearn’s latest book, *Theorising Power*, (Hearn, 2012) encapsulates important existing debates and theories of power, and adapts them to his own formulation. I will carefully draw connections between the theorists or their debates outlined in the last section and Hearn’s conceptualisations in order to illustrate that his work is one of the latest outcomes of the long-continuing discourse on power. Ideally, existing debates about power function as groundwork for the introduction of his own conceptualisation. Another important rationale behind my selection of Hearn’s work is the fact that he considers physical power as well as social power that is typically of interest to social scientists concerned with power. The importance of physical power in garden-related leisure pursuits was indicated in the last chapter where I described

the creation of gardens as an outcome of a series of physical power exercise over nature. In addition, I will also note Hearn's (2012) disagreement with ANT. Whilst social and political scientists have conventionally presupposed human beings as agents of power, non-human forces are inseparably entangled with garden-related leisure pursuits. By explaining Hearn's scepticism about ANT and disregard for power of nonhumans, I will suggest that there are some aspects of Open Gardens that his approach is not entirely able to explain.

3.2. Discourses on power

Before introducing Hearn's (2012) idea of power, I would like to outline other existing key theorists of power to lay some groundwork for his work. Power has been discussed in different social scientific fields, and there have been disputes concerning its meaning. Since it is very unrealistic to completely review the entire discourses on power (Haugaard, 2002; Lukes, 2005; Coles and Church: 2007), this section consists of five subsections on power theorists on which Hearn's (2012) conceptualisation appears to be premised. I first describe Marx and Weber as figures from which the fundamental notion of power as one's capability to affect others and the traditional domination model originate. I then recount Pareto, Mosca and Gramsci as theorists who question where power exists in the hierarchical social system. After this, Hunter, Mills and Parsons are introduced as theorists who further address the location of power in society, and cast doubt on the traditional domination model. I then construe Lukes, Bourdieu and Foucault as figures who reconsider where power lies and how we can detect power that operates tacitly.

I also give an overview of Actor-Network-Theory (ANT) with some explanation of how its founders Latour and Callon influenced the long-lasting debate about agency and the principle of human-intentionality of which the traditional notion of agency is composed. Whereas power has been typically debated in social, political and economic contexts, it is questionable whether this conventional approach to power is the most suitable for garden-related leisure pursuits in which the transformation of natural settings is taken for granted. Whilst ANT possesses several theoretical weaknesses, it shows a possibility that power can be discussed, theorised and conceptualised in a context where non-human forces play important roles. This is

because, unlike conventional perspectives on power, ANT symmetrically treats both humans and non-humans as agents of power. The ultimate aim of this section is thus to highlight ANT as a discourse that potentially transcends the limitation of previous power theories, broadens the horizon of power discourse and explores the ways in which power is contextualised within my research.

3.2.1. Marx and Weber: Power as capability and the origin of the traditional domination model

There have been many theorists of power over the centuries, however, I would like to start with Karl Marx because he appears to have been the first to discuss one of the essential understandings of power: capacity. Marx views power as the social capacity to influence the world, which for him is analogous to labour – in other words, the essence of human existence or ‘being’ (Hearn, 2012: 49). Labour is central to his analysis of the capitalist society (Thompson and Smith, 2009). By labour, Marx means not only paid work, but also further complex ideas surrounding it. According to him, under the capitalist circumstance in which he developed his thoughts, human beings in society can be divided into two main types: property owners and property-less workers (Marx, 1978). As indicated, Marx’s thinking on power is fundamentally associated with social class. Thus, the Marxist understanding of power is that power is possessed by a social class and is practiced in opposition to other classes’ capacity or interest (Poulantzas, 1986). In order to grasp the Marxist understanding of power, it is important not to limit the discussion to those who hold considerable power in the capitalist society. Indeed, Marx considered the lack of capacity of a property-less worker and their powerless status. This is represented by his idea of objectification (Marx, 1978: 71-72). The worker is deployed like a resource. The more wealth workers produce, the less they are treated in a humanistic manner. The worker hence objectifies himself or herself through the process of labour, and therefore the object produced as a result of labour is partly the worker himself or herself. In other words, the worker not only creates or produces commodities, but also even becomes a commodity. Therefore, labour is realised only through this objectification of the worker, and the worker perceives labour and its outcome to be estranged. As Marx puts it:

... the object which labour produces – labour’s product – confronts it as *something alien*, as a *power independent* of the producer. The product of labour is labour which has been congealed in an object, which has become material: it is the *objectification* of labour. Labour’s realization is its objectification. [Emphasis in the original] (Marx, 1978: 71)

The inference of this remark is that for Marx productivity is in inverse proportion to humanity in the relationship between property owners and property-less workers (Marx, 1996). His idea of objectification and estrangement of labour could be grasped more reasonably by considering some historical background. Under the capitalist regime and industrialisation, his time experienced the rapid development of large-scale mechanised production systems (Mackenzie, 1984). The Proletariat was the labour force behind this machine-like production, and was not treated in a humane manner. Such an alienated or estranged labour therefore essentially represented social inequality or unfairness, and also manifested that a social class’s interest is satisfied against other classes’ interest. Imagine a housekeeper who unwillingly weeds his or her employer’s garden as if a tractor continually turns over the soil. There is a certain social power relationship between the housekeeper and the garden owner, and the former’s inability to achieve his or her own will is juxtaposed with the latter’s ability to exploit the former.

Another German theorist who created the basis of today’s discourse on power along the lines of Marx and his notion of power as social capacity is Max Weber. Weber’s thinking on power has invited much criticism because he conceptualised power in relation to one person’s domination over others (Bruce and Yearley, 2006). In the essay *The Distribution of Power within the Political Community: Class, Status, Party*, Weber explains power and domination as follows. Power (*Macht*) is defined as “the probability that one actor within a social relationship will be in a position to carry out his own will despite resistance, regardless of the basis on which this probability rests” (Weber, 1968: 53). In keeping with the fact that Weber construes power as the undercurrent of social stratification (Scott and Marshall, 2009), his stance is aligned with that of Marx. However, Weber’s interpretation of power as ‘probability’ connotes uncertainty over the outcome – in other words, he does not presuppose the success of an exercise of power. Similarly, domination (*herrschaft*) too is defined as

“the probability that a command with a given specific content will be obeyed by a given group of persons” (Weber, 1968: 53). Weber (1968) notes that power is a ‘sociologically amorphous’ concept and is not precisely conceivable. His account therefore implicitly questions how we could detect power and domination. Power is not always obvious. Weber (1968) suggests one possible way to realise power is the direct observance of successful enactments of one’s power or dominance over others. What is fundamental to Weber’s analysis of domination is the empirical evidence of obedience (Bottoms and Tankebe, 2012). If there is, for instance, an observable existence of a garden owner telling a housekeeper to weed his or her vegetable garden, the owner’s dominance over the housekeeper surely exists. Weber’s notion of power, domination and probability might suggest considering how power signals its enactment.

The understanding of power as one’s capacity to make intended outcomes happen still remains in the locus of different definitions of power. Domination too is still seen as the most typical power relationship. In this light, Marx and Weber would have laid the groundwork for today’s debates about power. Even though their thinking on power relate to the social structure, where the powerful or the powerless exist in society is not clearly shown in their works. Some Italian theorists such as Pareto, Mosca and Gramsci, who I discuss next, were more clearly concerned with the position or location of power holders in the social stratification.

3.2.2. Pareto, Mosca and Gramsci: Location of power in the hierarchical social system

Just as Marx and Weber did, some Italian theorists discussed power in relation to social stratification. As the historical background to their theoretical formation of power, fascism was the influential regime that thinkers in those days could not overlook. As prominent theorists who discussed power in relation to the fascist regime, in this subsection I briefly recount Vilfredo Pareto, Gaetano Mosca and Antonio Gramsci.

Vilfredo Pareto, who first used the term ‘elite’ (Scott and Marshall, 2009), is known for his belief that societies are all categorised into those who rule and those who are

ruled, and that it is nonsense to think it could be otherwise (Hearn, 2012). One might observe a legacy of Marx's perspective on the hierarchical relationship between property owners and property-less workers. Pareto, however, does not reckon that the elite is permanently able to maintain its own ruling status. In one of his books *The Rise and Fall of the Elites*, Pareto (1968) rather expresses his interest in social mobility and describes the equilibrium between the power which the feudal nobility preserves and its disposal. From a historical perspective, the decline of previously-established prosperity may be a common *a priori* scenario. We have already seen in the literature review that country houses and their gardens constructed by powerful figures during feudal times are now transferred into, and maintained by, different conservation trusts.

Etymologically, elite, or *aristocrazia* in Italian, refers to “the strongest, the most energetic and most capable” (Pareto, 1968: 36), but its dominion is not permanent and determinate. It is rather temporal and dependent on laws that provides the elites with authority. In this light, Pareto views the history of humans as the history of repeated replacement of elites. In understanding Pareto's perspective on the ruling elites, it is essential to consider how he relates their socio-political power to laws. As Pareto (1968) puts it “Where class *A* enjoys legal privileges and the laws are wrongly interpreted in its favour and against class *B*, it is obvious that *A* has, or is about to have, the advantage over *B*, and vice versa” (63-64). This remark indicates that laws accredit a class's privilege – in other words, the privilege can be illegal where no approval is received. In the same quotation, Pareto also mentions that the privileged class deliberately interpret laws to give themselves advantages over other classes. Therefore, by inference, the legality of a specific class's privilege may be indefinite and may not be agreeable for some people in the same society. Pareto's consideration of the relation between power and law is important, as it was an early work on complexities surrounding the perception of legitimacy of power.

Gaetano Mosca is also known for his work on elites. He shows a similar view to Pareto's, but more clearly illustrates that society has a pyramid structure that consists of an organised minority with greater power and an unorganised majority with little

power (Merriam, 1940). In his magnum opus *The Ruling Class*, Mosca (1939) carefully analyses how the ruling class is fragmented and who has the actual, operational and greatest power in the pyramid social structure, by taking the hereditary king or emperor as examples. Such a monarch is located on the top of the pyramid structure, but their influence on the politics of their own country may be limited. Who holds the actual governing ability and supreme control over the internal politics is rather those who typically are the second highest in the hierarchy, such as elected president or prime minister. Applying this view to garden-related contexts, large gardens attached to state mansions are often maintained by a team. Even though the person whose position is the highest is typically the owner, the actual and operational power is possessed by the head gardener. Of course, as Mosca (1939) indicates, such a simplified view might only be fair under democratic or constitutional regimes, and hence is not applicable to countries that had absolute monarchy such as Turkey or Russia in those days.

In addition to this segmental analysis of the ruling class, Mosca (1939) also develops his idea of rejuvenation. By this term, he means the ways in which members of the ruling class maintain their inherited power. Pareto (1968) illustrates that feudal nobility's inherited power weakened generation by generation, which indicated that hereditary aristocrats' social superiority rarely last permanently. As a typical means of rejuvenating their declining superiority, Mosca (1939) suggests proud announcements of supernatural origins, educational histories, family traditions and different kinds of the highest mentality relevant to warfare such as courage or loyalty. To sum up, Mosca's idea of rejuvenation is some of the elites' resistance to their declining status. Despite their higher position in the pyramid structure of society, their status as an organised minority with greater power is not permanent. Mosca's work on rejuvenation is an indication of instability of social stratifications.

Pareto and Mosca both consider the socially powerful group of people and their fall. Ironically, their thoughts on the elite and ruling class were utilised by fascists to defend and justify their regime although the degree to which Pareto and Mosca supported it is highly debated (Hearn, 2012). As is self-evident in their works, those

who are in higher positions in the hierarchical social structure are normally seen as powerful. Antonio Gramsci, however, shows a slightly different view, and hence is insightful in considering who has power and where they are located in the social stratification. Unlike his contemporaries who stressed the bourgeois' coercive domination in the capitalist society, Gramsci claimed to observe a more nuanced manner of domination that receives the agreement of the proletariat (Haugaard, 2009). Contrary to Pareto and Mosca, Gramsci showed a clear objection against fascism, and was a leading proponent of socialist and communist ideologies (Hearn, 2012).

Gramsci is widely known for the concept of *hegemony*. Whereas Gramscian scholars have interpreted hegemony differently, one of the common understandings is a situation in which a class's power over other classes is unquestioned although there is an existing antagonism between the classes (Thompson, 2016). In other words, hegemony for Gramsci is understood as the taken-for-granted solidity of the ruling class's dominance over the ruled classes. Scott (2001) explains this by contextualising what Marx coined 'the ruling ideas' of a society: the elite's status as the ruling and other classes' status as the ruled exist as a *fait accompli*, and hence remains unquestioned. The Gramscian concept of hegemony is also understood as 'domination by consent', and connotes that the acquisition of legitimacy is not necessarily confrontational (Clegg, 2010). In order for a political system to be consensual, the ruling class has to gain the agreement of other classes, or to make other classes acquiesce in the will of the ruling class. This point leads to the necessity of persuasion. Thus, a Gramscian interpretation of hegemony of a political class means that the class is successful in inducing other classes of society to accept its own political ideologies and moral values (Daldal, 2014).

As indicated above, Gramsci's idea of hegemony questions the stereotype of political leadership. A class that is more socially powerful than other classes may not necessarily be positioned higher than others, as Gramsci (1971) states that "The intellectuals are the dominant group's 'deputies' exercising the subaltern functions of social hegemony and political government" (12). This comment implies that the

actual and operational power is given to the other class. Hearn (2012) construes the Gramscian notion of hegemony as “the political leadership of the proletariat over other classes and groups, such as peasants and intellectuals” (61-62). Gramsci (1971) is concerned with the necessity of radical social mobilisation and devolution of political leadership, which is expressed in his reflection on the French Revolution. The implication from this is that Gramsci claims the importance of wider participation in political decision-making. In this light, Gramsci can be highlighted as a theorist who orientated our attention towards the involvement of less socially powerful people in power relationships. I recounted in the literature review that the public opening of botanic gardens developed at the request of the general public. Power relationships are not fully comprehended if one sticks solely to those with considerable power, and hence equal attention needs to be paid to those with little power.

This section provided a brief overview of three Italian theorists of power: Pareto, Mosca and Gramsci. Pareto and Mosca discuss the elites and their higher social position. Both of them show a particular interest in the fall of elites. Mosca further discusses how the declining elites rejuvenate their power. As presupposed in Pareto and Mosca’s works on the elites, those who are powerful are often presumed to be in a higher position than others in the hierarchical social system. Gramsci, however, casts doubt on such an assumption. His idea of hegemony suggests that where a class’s ruling status, their political ideology and moral values are taken for granted or consensually agreed by other classes, those whose social position is relatively low can also be seen as a possessor of a certain power. Whilst the power of those in lower social positions is usually orchestrated by machinations of the dominant class, the assumption that the socially powerful person is always member of a higher social stratum might not be fair in some situations. Whether this assumption is true or not may depend on how one defines power. If power is defined as the capacity to dominate or rule others, those who are in a higher position in the social structure are perhaps seen as more powerful. On the contrary, if power is defined in relation to resistance, one might anticipate power appearing in lower social stratification levels. Italian theorists therefore suggest the importance of how one defines power. The

location of power in the social structure was also of significance to some American theorists who encountered the difficulty in observing and identifying power.

3.2.3. Hunter, Mills and Parsons: Power structure and scepticism about the domination model

In the middle of the 20th century, the discourse on power came to be led by American sociologists. Like the aforementioned Italian theorists, American sociologists were also concerned with the social structure and the ways in which those with great power rule those with little power. In this subsection, I mention three leading figures who addressed these subjects: Floyd Hunter, C. Wright Mills and Talcott Parsons.

Floyd Hunter's (1953) *Community Power Structure: A Study of Decision Makers* is probably best known for his view that urban power is structured by small networks and also for his unique way to find the powerful. What he coins 'reputational method' is to ask community leaders in the regional city where he conducted the fieldwork to identify those who they thought were powerful and capable of making decisions. The most frequently identified were targeted for interviews about who holds power, who is acquainted with whom and how local policy issues are addressed (Hearn, 2012). This method implies that Hunter's belief that power is something emanating from specific individuals. However, just as Weber (1978) understands power as an inconceivable concept, Hunter (1953) does not view power as a reified concept, but as an abstract idea which denotes a structural explanation of social process. Despite the fact that he operationally defines power as a "word that will be used to describe the acts of men [sic] going about the business of moving other men [sic] to act in relation to themselves or in relation to organic or inorganic things" (Hunter, 1953: 2-3), he also acknowledges that power has certain aspects that cannot be spoken about with certainty. Hunter's notion of power offers an important suggestion. Even though power has been widely debated in social and political sciences, the concept sometimes lacks a consensus on what it is and where it is located. This leads to a diversity of opinion on the ways in which researchers can detect power. I shall come back to this point and discuss in detail in the next subsection.

C. Wright Mills is also interested in the power structure in American society, but approaches it from a macro viewpoint. Mills' (1956) widely debated book *The Power Elite* illuminates that under drastically-changing social circumstances, such as the Great Depression, the New Deal and preparation for the Second World War, major national power became largely centralised into American power elites in three types of dominant social spheres: the economic, the political and the military (Hearn, 2012). What Mills (1956) refers to as a 'power elite' is members of such higher circles that may be conceived of high social strata or upper social class, and also of possessors of considerable power, wealth and prestige. These groups are identified as the decision-makers who were able to orientate American society towards the directions they favoured. The uniqueness of Mills' view was that he paid attention to not only numerically measurable scales, but also qualitative and psychological characters of power elites. For example, Mills (1956) mentions that power elites may be defined according to mental superiority such as high morality. Thus, his approach defines power elite in terms of their shared qualitative and psychological characters, instead of their quantifiable affluence or social position. Mills (1956) further notes that no matter how considerable their power may be, the power elites may be less aware of it. This point implies that there may be a difference between objectively measured powerfulness and subjectively perceived powerfulness. Mills was concerned with the difference in the perception of power and the ways to define and study power. This increasing awareness of the methodology of power characterises Mills' discussion regarding structural analysis of American powerful figures.

Mills' work on the national power structure invited important criticism from Talcott Parsons. Parsons' (1957) *Distribution of Power in American Society* critically comments on Mills' (1956) *The Power Elite* because it focuses solely on the ruler's power over the ruled without questioning the traditional domination model that originates from Weber (Bruce and Yearley, 2006). The power relationship is not limited to such a zero-sum game in which A completely wins B, and power could be symmetrically distributed to people (Hearn, 2012). This argument would seem reasonable where the micro power structure in the relationship between garden owners and gardeners is speculated on. Today it is unrealistic that the owner deploys

their gardeners in brutal and inhuman manners like a master-servant relationship in ancient society where slaves were forced to engage in physical labour. In modernised and civilised societies, such a complete control over others is not thought to be the only model of power structure. Even though ‘domination’ by nature has a negative connotation, as I have explained earlier, Gramsci’s idea of hegemony implicates domination by consent. Indeed, Parsons’ criticism of Mills spills over into the presumed negativity in power. Thus, by equally addressing one’s capacity to influence others as well as one’s power over others, Parsons argues that power can function positively (Hearn, 2012). If an employed gardener receives a sufficient and satisfactory amount of salary in compensation for backbreaking work in his or her employer’s garden, the relationship between the two might be win-win. Of course, the context in which Mills developed his idea on power is essentially different from that of leisure and tourism studies. However, instead of a completely uneven dispersion of power, more nuanced power relationships should be expected to be, or be likely to be observed.

It is also noteworthy that Parsons (1957) problematises the way in which Mills defines what he calls ‘power elite’. According to Parsons (1957), Mills presumes that the power of decision-making is held by small and relatively integrated groups of people whose position in hierarchical structures is higher than that of others. For Mills the power elites are exclusive to those who are in ‘command posts’ in society. However, Parsons (1957) points out that this is not necessarily the case, especially in democratic and decentralised associations, as he remarks that Mills “relegates Congress – even the most influential group of Senators – to what he calls the ‘middle level’ of the power structure; such people do not belong to the ‘power elite’” (125). This restricted interpretation of the ‘power elite’ is closely associated with the fact that Mills understands the term ‘social class’ solely as economic stratification (Parsons, 1957). In short, the salient point of Parsons’ critical reflections on Mills is the assumption that power is a determinate concept. In situations where no one’s complete domination over others exists, it may be difficult to define ‘the powerfulness’. One possible implication from the above debates is that power rather

incorporates some fluidity in itself, and the perception of power differs depending on from which perspectives one approaches power.

This subsection outlined Hunter, Mills and Parsons as thinkers of the location of power. Like the Italian sociologists, Hunter and Mills also debated the connection between power and social structure, but the latter more clearly described who holds the power. There was also a burgeoning interest in the methodology of power discourse. Hunter (1953) did not perceive power as a reified concept, indicating the importance of considering different ways to detect power. Mills' (1956) work on American power elites implied that the definition of 'powerful' may be ambiguous, especially where one takes into consideration different approaches to it, such as objective versus subjective, or quantitative versus qualitative. Such indeterminacy of power discussed by Mills invited Parsons' (1957) criticism; Parsons claimed that Mills dismissed powerful social groups as non-powerful circles. One implication from this debate is that power is not necessarily observable, and can rather be unobservable. This interest in the location of power and the ways to identify power is more carefully discussed in the next generation.

3.2.4. Lukes, Bourdieu and Foucault: Reconsideration of where power exists and how we can discover it

In this subsection, I discuss three theorists of power: Steven Lukes, Pierre Bourdieu and Michel Foucault. Despite the fact that these three are usually not discussed together, I personally think that they fall under the same umbrella. This is because they all raise awareness of the difficulty of understanding where power lies and offer fascinating insights into the ways in which we discover it. Such methodological concerns are, in my opinion, certainly along the lines of the debate of the last subsection, where Hunter's view on power as a vague and abstract concept, and Mills' thinking on the potential discrepancy between objectively measured power and subjectively perceived power represented a burgeoning interest in the methodology of power.

Hunter and Mills' approaches are in part known as 'pluralist' which emphasises the wide distribution of power amongst different groups, and also as 'behaviourist'

which emphasises research methods that only reveal observable operation of power (Hearn, 2012). Steven Lukes and his influential work *Power: A Radical View* (2005) is an insightful criticism that attempts to transcend the ‘pluralist’ and ‘behaviourist’ approaches. Lukes (2005) calls the pluralist approach ‘the one-dimensional’ view of power and sees it as inadequate because of its limited scope that solely sees overt and observable power conflicts that occur where decisions on public policies are made. If, for example, an owner of a garden orders his or her gardeners to trim hedges on the edge of his or her estate, a passer-by would witness and instantly assume an asymmetrical power relationship between them. What Lukes labels ‘the two-dimensional’ view of power considers both decision-making and nondecision-making. Nondecision-making is a decision that ends up in the termination of latent resistance to the values or interests of the decision-maker (Lukes, 2005). Even though sociologists assume that power refers to one’s capability of being wary of ending up in conflict against the will of others, Lukes’ two-dimensional view indicates that power also refers to one’s capability of preventing other’s objections from arising in the first place (Scott and Marshall, 2009). Imagine, again, a garden owner peremptorily issuing an instruction to a gardener. The garden owner is so forceful that the gardener has no choice apart from obedience, but what if the gardener has a resistant attitude towards the order given by the owner? The two-dimensional view is therefore a tacit inference that observable power operations are not all about the backgrounds to given situations, and hence the behaviourist potentially fails to unveil some hidden power operations.

By ‘the three-dimensional’ view of power, Lukes more clearly focuses upon the covert or hidden power operating as an undercurrent of power relationships. Departing from the critique of ‘pluralist’ and ‘behaviourist’ approaches to power, Lukes reaches the view that power conflicts may not be apparent to anyone, especially outsiders. What is going on in leisure and tourism phenomena is often latent and inconceivable to outsiders (Aitchison, 2003). In particular, private gardens by nature internalise domestic characteristics. For instance, housekeepers who are forced to conduct physical labour in the garden may conspire with each other against their master who treats them inhumanely. The conspiracy is secret and unseen so that

outsiders are rarely aware of the fact. Investigating unapparent operations of power is one of the methodological challenges faced by social scientists, and Lukes' idea of the three-dimensional view on power would be helpful to reveal hidden power operations in private gardens.

Lukes is undoubtedly inspiring in terms of seeking where power lies and how power can be conceived. Another theorist whose work follows a similar direction to that of Lukes is Pierre Bourdieu. He is a philosopher and self-trained anthropologist who is interested in power relationships, particularly dominative ones, amongst social classes, and how they are structured and re-produced (Hearn, 2012). *Habitus*, which is one of the key concepts of his thinking, is the product of the conditions of particular classes and their long lasting characteristics (Bourdieu, 1990). Importantly, in its process of being passed from generation to generation, *habitus* is often intangible, as he remarks that “The *habitus* – embodied history, internalised as a second nature and so forgotten as history – is the active presence of the whole past of which it is the product” [Emphasis in the original] (Bourdieu, 1990: 56). Power is, as a matter of course, one of the possible features that a class can incorporate within itself. It is inherited from the older generation, tacitly operates as a background against which the specific behavioural pattern of the class is defined and is often taken for granted. Since power that underlies a specific social group may not be easily accessible, the ways in which one detects power matters. In order to address this point, another of his other key conceptions, capital, is insightful.

The term ‘capital’ in general has an economic connotation, and hence is thought to be accumulated through mercantile activities in a material manner. Symbolic capital is the accumulated immaterial labour in the conduct of prestige or honour (Bourdieu, 1990), and has different branches such as social capital which measures one’s social network, or cultural capital which measures one’s realised form of valuable knowledge (Bourdieu, 1986; Moore, 2012). Bourdieu explains that both economic and symbolic capitals are closely intertwined, stating that “Interest, in the restricted sense it is given in economic theory, cannot be produced without producing its negative counterpart, disinterestedness” (Bourdieu, 2006: 105). Symbolic capital is a

transubstantiated form of economic counterpart (Bourdieu, 1986), which implies that the former could operate as an indicator of the latter. Whilst economic capital might be an important factor when measuring one's accumulated power, all kinds of capital including economic, symbolic and branches of symbolic capital such as social capital or cultural capital equally indicate each other (Hearn, 2012). Bourdieu's thinking on capital therefore indicates that power can be transposed and can have different kinds of faces or presentations. Power is manifested in different forms, and the garden is certainly one of the forms that manifest one's powerfulness. Let me reiterate that the garden has historically functioned as status signalling (Bhatti and Church, 2001; Charlesworth, 1986; Evans, 2000; Martin et al., 1993). Bourdieu's thinking on capital therefore reminds us that the garden could be an indicator of one's power.

Another French thinker who is also important to the question of where power exists and how we can discover it is Michel Foucault. His understanding of power is fundamentally relational and based on the view that power exists and operates within a network of relationships (Heizmann, Olsson and Chase, 2015). Foucault (1980) states that "Power in the substantive sense, '*le*' *pouvoir*, doesn't exist... The idea that there is either located at – or emanating from – a given point something which is a 'power' seems to me to be based on a misguided analysis..." [Emphasis in the original] (198). Thus, for Foucault, power is not positional. Even if there is a ruler, conqueror, monarch or even a dictator, his or her power (or domination) over others is not tangible unless there are more than two agents because power only matters in networks or relations. In the micro-sociological context too, power structures of relatively small communities are, for Foucauldian scholars, only made possible by the existence of multiple actors. If this view is applied to garden-related phenomena, power cannot exist when one concentrates upon a single actor who is involved in the garden. On the contrary, power turns into a meaningful concept that is worth examining if one considers different kinds of actors engaging in the garden. In keeping with the fact that Open Gardens are collaboratively managed by garden openers, their helpers, volunteers, and the staff of Scotland's Gardens, Foucault's relational view on power shows its potentiality to contribute to the exploration of subtle power operations amongst them.

What underlies the basis of a Foucauldian notion of power is the concept of *discourse*. In Foucault's post-structuralism sense, the concept denotes "The study of language, its structure, functions, and patterns in use" (Scott and Marshall, 2009: 61). Discourses are peculiar to specific networks of social institutions, and hence correspond to characteristics of a person and of the institution to which the person belongs. Discourse therefore varies according to academic subject or commercial industry. Horticultural discourse is, for example, the structure, function and pattern of the language and knowledge peculiar to gardeners, herbalists, botanists, landscape architects and any other kinds of people whose specialities are relevant to gardens or plants grown there. Certain types of discourse enable people relevant to them to speak the truth (Foucault, 1980: 109-133). For example, qualified and experienced gardeners are expected to provide novices with useful advice – in other words, to have the authority to recommend courses of action to be taken. Since individuals with specialties hold the power to talk about trusted information, Foucault's perspective on power is essentially inseparable from knowledge. Furthermore, there are sets of accepted principles that govern, shape and define a specific style of language. Foucault explains this point with the idea of 'discursive formation': "whenever, between objects, types of statement, concepts, or thematic choices, one can define a regularity (an order, correlations, positions and functionings, transformations), we will say...that we are dealing with a discursive formation" (Foucault, 1972: 38). Since a discourse is a concept that characterises specific people or groups of people, it helps us understand what an individual with specialised knowledge or qualification is able to do and how he or she can influence others.

Discourse is closely connected to Foucault's relational view of power. There are numerous kinds of power relations spread across our society. For Foucault, these power relations are outcomes of discourses, as he remarks that "in a society such as ours, but basically in any society, there are manifold relations of power which permeate, characterise and constitute the social body, and these relations of power cannot themselves be established, consolidated nor implemented without the production, accumulation, circulation and functioning of a discourse" (Foucault,

1980: 93). The Foucauldian notion of discourse is, in short, a reminder that power for him is not positional. Since Foucault thought that power is not located in specific individuals or groups of individuals, Foucault's perspective on power is often critiqued when questioning the concept of agent. By 'agent' theorists of power usually mean human beings who are able to intentionally affect others (Hearn, 2012). However, this principle of human-intentionality may not be adequate for some contexts in which non-human elements play an important role or in which power does not emanate from anything but rather operates relationally. It is therefore almost inevitable in the study of power to question what qualifies an agent. Foucault's thinking about power and relevant concepts are useful because they could assist us with some further discussion about the definition of agency.

As I argued at the beginning of this subsection, Lukes, Bourdieu and Foucault can be considered together because they were all interested in the epistemology of power. Lukes' criticism about pluralist and behaviourist approaches to power and his idea of the three-dimensional perspective on power reflected the possibility that the operation of power can be tacit and not easily observed. Bourdieu's re-conceptualisation of capital orientated us towards different power presentations. His argument that power is symbolically represented in different forms suggested that there are different ways in which power is manifested, and from which we can detect power accordingly. I also drew upon Foucault whose notion of power rests upon the view that it is essentially relational, rather than positional or locational. His concept of discourse was an insight into the functioning of specialised knowledge or skills as sources of power and into its enactment between multiple agents. Foucault's relational view on power left different intellectual legacies and stimulated thinkers of power to question whether it must be or needs to be only human power relationships that social scientists consider. This question has been directly addressed by Actor-Network-Theory, which I discuss in the next subsection.

3.2.5. Latour and Callon: Actor-Network-Theory and non-humans as power exerciser

Actor-Network-Theory (ANT) is a methodological tradition that is heavily influenced by Foucault's relational notion of power. ANT is not a theory because it

does not offer any fixed ways by which to approach the world, but is a general sensitive attitude towards the heterogeneity surrounding our culture and society (Latour, 1999; Law, 1999). The defining character of ANT is indeterminacy, which means that actors are not limited to humans, and that any of their characteristics such as the actor's size, psychological make-up and the motivations behind its action are not predetermined (Callon, 2007). The founders of this intellectual tradition, Bruno Latour and Michel Callon, try to replace humanism with what they coined 'heterogeneity', and evaded prioritisation of minds over materials (Munro, 2009). Reshuffling all kinds of actors such as humans, artefacts made by humans, the animal world and the inanimate world (Hearn, 2012; Law, 2009), these are all thought to be socially compatible in ANT (Latour, 2007). One of ANT's characteristics is therefore its "symmetrical treatment of human and non-human actors" (Lowe, 2001: 327). For ANT, the social is neither the sole nor *a priori* resource of explanation, and hence ANT refrains from presuming that topics typically discussed by social scientists, such as power, are inherently associated with the social (Ren, Jóhannesson and van der Duim, 2012). Thus, whilst ANT has invited much criticism (I shall revisit this point in the next section on Hearn's conceptualisation), it could potentially broaden the horizon of social sciences and the discourse on power.

ANT challenges the traditional understanding of agency which means, as Hearn (2012) explains, the principle of human-intentionality. In other words, agency is conventionally understood as human beings' intentional impact on others. For example, gardeners prune plants so that they will grow faster. This act of cutting branches off is what the conventional perspective on agency denotes because it is intentionally done by human beings. For researchers of the ANT school, intentionality is not a prerequisite for power because power enacts and matters even unintentionally. What is important for them is *de facto* power operation, and explanations of the occurrence of such events are left spurious (Munro, 2009). In ANT, power does not emanate from a specific agent, but operates in 'associations'. This objection against 'power source' and appreciation of 'power association' is what ANT advocates mean by *agencement* (Munro, 2009). In short, ANT is radical,

as it does not consider who (or what) the power holder is, and examines both humans and non-humans through the same analytical lens.

ANT can bring insights to the leisure and tourism arena to which garden-related pursuits belong. Non-human factors are inseparably connected with some leisure and tourism phenomena (Haldrup and Larsen, 2006; Lemelin, 2013; Ren, 2011). Such phenomena are not seen in ANT as humanly possible products, but rather as more ‘contaminated relations’ between humans and non-humans (Jóhannesson, van der Duim and Ren, 2012). When one considers non-humans as well as humans, their physical power often begin to be realised as important. As I emphasised in the literature review, not only social power, but also physical power is of equal importance to garden-related contexts. Gardens are quasi-natural settings where the transformation of natural resources is taken for granted (Mausner, 1996), as are the outcome of human physical power deployment over nature. Humans, nevertheless, are not necessarily more powerful than nature. Nature’s dynamics can destroy or devastate the dedicated horticultural creations of human beings. As a result, for example, the creator’s established fame as a horticulturalist and the trustworthiness of his or her horticultural discourse might be questioned. This implies that physical power and social power can be intertwined in garden-related contexts.

In the specific context of Open Gardens, the potentiality of ANT could be suggested by considering some likely impact of power of nature on human’s mobility. It is often the case that natural disasters restrict tourists’ or visitors’ travels. The number of visitors to Open Gardens is often a variable dependent on outdoor condition. Nature could harm humans or even deprive them of life. Potential risks in Open Gardens, such as a slippery deck on the side of a pond, might be a great concern for parents with small children or for people in wheelchairs. In addressing the risk management of such an outdoor environment, we normally consider, as a matter of course, that safety precautions are built on the dualistic ontology which is concerned with human’s encounter with nature (Haug, 2012). This is the ultimate reminder of our status as inhabitants of the earth, and tourism is essentially an earthy endeavour (Jóhannesson et al., 2012). Open Gardens are co-produced by different kinds of

human agents. Nature, as a predictable powerful non-human agent in Open Gardens, may influence not only garden openers who maintain their gardens and offer them as leisure and tourism resources, but also their associates who collaboratively prepare for, and operate, Open Gardens. ANT can help us address how the human-nature relationships are intertwined with human production of Open Gardens.

As explained above, ANT is an intellectual standpoint that has been influenced by Foucault's relational understanding of power. It is characterised by indeterminacy, its symmetrical treatment of humans and non-humans and its disagreement with the principle of human-intentionality of which the concept of agency traditionally comprises. Its suitability for garden-related contexts in general, and Open Gardens more specifically, was suggested above because the power of nature lurks as a matter of course in garden-related leisure and tourism pursuits. Not only the natural world and its inhabitants, but also other kinds of non-human forces or factors are entangled in humans' leisure and tourism experiences. These heterogeneous elements are brought together by ANT perspectives (van der Duim, 2007). It is noteworthy that ANT is not the latest theoretical standpoint of this kind, and different similar discourses that stem from ANT have been established, particularly in the field of human or social and cultural geographies. For example, the recent advocacy of 'more-than-human social geography' (Panelli, 2010) or 'animal geography' (Johnston, 2008) is ANT's intellectual heritage that orientates human geographers' attention towards non-human agents. These legacies of ANT commonly question whether it is adequate to solely consider humans and their social power. Different kinds of post-ANT perspectives may substantiate its impact on social scientific fields.

Concluding the entire section, I have briefly outlined how the discourse on power has evolved over centuries. Marx and Weber were essential to the understanding that power refers to one's capacity and domination. Works by two Italian sociologists, Pareto and Mosca, were helpful in explaining that power matters in the hierarchical social system. Gramsci's view on hegemony, however, implied that 'powerful' does not necessarily mean being at the top of the hierarchy. Similarly, as observed in Hunter and Mills' perspectives, American debates were also concerned with power

structures and the ways in which the powerful figures at the top of the structure rule those who were relatively powerless. Nonetheless, Parsons questioned such a completely imbalanced power relationship model in which A absolutely dominates B, and presumed negativity to which sociologists tend to attribute power. I also recounted Lukes who argued, with his three-dimensional view on power, that power operations can be latent, tacit or covert, and emphasised the importance of paying attention to hidden power exercises. This led to Bourdieu's work on capital, which implies that power transposes itself to different forms, and Foucault's view that power is relational, rather than positional. I also discussed ANT, Foucault's intellectual heritage, which treats both humans and non-humans as actors involved in the power relationship. Power has conventionally been debated in the socio-political context. Unlike this convention, ANT's disregarding of human-intentionality indicated the potentiality to analyse power operations in the co-production of Open Gardens to which both human agents and non-human agents, namely nature, are of importance. Therefore, ANT is able to transcend the traditional power discourses and offer more possibilities for understanding Open Gardens.

Even though there are other theorists that have not been mentioned, those discussed above are important figures and facilitate the introduction to Hearn's (2012) conceptualisation of power. As demonstrated in detail in the next section, Hearn (2012) encapsulates important points of the above-discussed existing debates over power. In summary, all the discussions I have offered above are in part to provide a brief overview of salient points regarding existing debates about the discourses on power, and in part to lay some groundwork for Hearn's (2012) power framework.

3.3. Hearn's conceptualisation of power

I now introduce Jonathan Hearn's (2012) conceptualisation of power as the theoretical framework through which Scottish Open Gardens will be analysed. Hearn defines power as "the capacity of some agents (broadly defined) to achieve intended and foreseen effects on other agents and the world more generally" (Hearn, 2012: 16). The primary rationale behind the selection of his conceptualisation of power is its suitability for leisure studies, namely garden-related phenomena. His contextualisation of power in the socio-political context touches upon, and starts with

physical power that is essential for the examination of various forms of leisure. Considering that gardens are quasi-natural settings (Mausner, 1996), the exercise of physical power is of fundamental importance to the transformation of the untouched natural landscape into a garden. It is also noteworthy that Hearn's conceptualisation encapsulates the aforementioned debates on power. I therefore, where necessary, revisit theorists that I recounted in the previous section.

This section explains key concepts upon which Hearn's conceptualisation is premised: physical power versus social power, power to versus power over, domination, authority and legitimacy. I attempt to exemplify these concepts by referring to different garden-related cases. In order to elaborately account for some complex aspects of power, especially authority and legitimacy, I also refer to supplemental sources. In addition, I touch upon his disagreement with ANT and with its symmetrical treatment of humans and non-humans as a potential limitation of his approach. As discussed in 3.2.5, the applicability of the principle of human-intentionality to garden-related contexts is questionable. This section thus pursues two objectives. On the one hand, I claim the suitability of Hearn's (2012) power conceptualisation for the analysis of Open Gardens, but on the other hand, I also implicate its potential limitation as an analytical tool used to explain leisure and tourism phenomena to which non-human forces are of significance.

3.3.1. Physical power versus social power

Hearn (2012) initiates his conceptualisation with the distinction between physical power and social power. Physical power is defined as "stored energy that is released and transformed under the right conditions" (Hearn, 2012: 4). The deployment of physical power is essential to the creation of gardens. I have already recounted in the literature review that the garden is a quasi-natural setting (Mausner, 1996). Enclosing, cultivating, seeding, watering, sprouting, blooming and withering are all tangible, observable and intended/unintended modification of physical objects. Gardening could therefore be interpreted as a series of physical power exercises. Human beings do not necessarily pursue absolute domination over nature because, as the idea of English landscape garden showed in Chapter 2, human appreciation of natural landscapes is one of the meanings of gardens. Moreover, human beings may not be

more powerful than nature. The creation of gardens and their quality can be in part dependent on weather conditions. As Foucault's (1980, 1972) concept of discourse indicates, the possession of specialised knowledge and skills may enable gardeners to grow plants easily. Thus, the extent to which human beings successfully exercise physical power over nature when creating gardens may be determined by their competence in dialogue with the natural world. Without considering physical power, power operations and human-nature relations in garden-related contexts would not be holistically understood.

I have already described in the literature review that physical power is closely associated with social power in garden-related leisure phenomena, and the latter is, not surprisingly, the subject that usually draws the attention of social scientists. Social power is defined by Hearn (2012) as "the kind of power human beings deploy when they act on the world" (5). Hearn's definitions of both physical and social power indicate that whilst physical power has uncertainty about where and amongst what agents power operates, social power usually operates within the human social world and amongst human relationships. More precisely, in social power operations, the subject that exercises power and the object over which the power is exercised are always human beings. For this reason, social power has predominately interested social scientists. Let me re-highlight works of Pareto (1968), Mosca (1939), Gramsci (1971), Hunter (1953), Mills (1956) and Parsons (1957). As illustrated by their debates on power structure and hierarchical social system, for social scientists 'power relationships' conventionally mean interpersonal networks of humans. In garden-related contexts too, as the review of literature on garden history implicated, social power relationships exist in interpersonal relationships such as the one between a garden owner and employed gardeners.

Physical power and social power are not entities that should be examined separately, but are often intertwined. Farmer (2013) describes, in a paper on the garden park at Hesdin in Northern France, that by modifying the natural landscape, its owner Count Robert intended to symbolise his aristocratic power such as his wealth or position within the Capetian royal family that conquered the Kingdom of France and the

Kingdom of Sicily. This study suggests that one's capacity to mould natural landscape into gardens can be an indicator of his or her social status, and the impact of affluence on others. Thus, social power could be manifested by physical power. It is also noteworthy that such socially powerful garden owners usually do not exert physical power by themselves, but commission employed gardeners to use physical power in order to make changes to their gardens. Social power is therefore analogous to physical power. Hearn states that "The analogies may be dubious, but the connections are real" (Hearn, 2012: 6). Power operations can be so complex that it is important to carefully describe who or what has power and over whom or what that power is exercised. The concepts that enable us to perform this task are 'power to' and 'power over'.

3.3.2. 'Power to' versus 'power over'

The concepts that further assist us with the analysis of physical and social power are 'power to' and 'power over'. According to Hearn (2012), 'power to' refers to the ability to exercise power and to influence other agents, and 'power over' refers to the object over which power is exercised. This is certainly an intellectual legacy of Marx who regarded power as social capacity and Weber who understood power as one's domination over others (Hearn, 2012). Importantly, the combination of 'power to' and 'power over' is not Hearn's own invention, and has been suggested by different theorists. For instance, Dowding (1996) notes that the complexity surrounding power could be reductively explained by means of the two analytical tools: 'power to' and 'power over'. Etymologically, the term 'power' originates from the Latin word '*potere*' which means 'to be able', and essentially connotes 'domination' (Morriss, 1987). 'Power to' and 'power over' are the inseparable combination that helps us analyse power in a simple way.

This distinction between 'power to' and 'power over' is useful because, as Wrong (2002) notes, power is treated both as an attribute and an indicator of action or interaction. Distinguishing them effectively makes sense of power operations presented in a range of leisure activities. When a human being removes or cuts weeds in the garden by means of a lawnmower, it may be that he or she has 'power to'

modify the natural resource. More precisely, the person just has ‘power to’ use the lawnmower and it is the machine that has ‘power to’ modify the natural resource. In this case, both agents present their ‘power over’ nature. The distinction between ‘power to’ and ‘power over’ concisely illuminate who or what holds power and who or what is influenced by that power.

The combination of ‘power to’ and ‘power over’ is also closely associated with the manifestation of power. Hearn (2012) explains that, since one cannot exercise power without the ability to do so, ‘power to’ is a pre-condition for ‘power over’ and ‘power over’ is a manifestation of ‘power to’. This view agrees with that of Dowding (2011) who explains that the defining feature of ‘power over’ connotes effects or results caused by power, and ‘power to’ is understood as one’s ability to cause specific effects. This formation suggests that in a single unit of power operation ‘power to’ is anterior, and ‘power over’ is posterior. Let me take an artificial pond as an example. To construct this, humans need to possess a certain physical ‘power to’ dig the ground and irrigate. This ‘power to’ can be manifested by the actual presence of the artificial pond. The pond exists as a substantiation of humans’ superior status to nature. Humans have control over nature, and this ‘power over’ manifests humans ‘power to’ modify natural resources. The pond is the materialised outcome of this ‘power to’, and hence does not exist prior to the actual exercise of the ‘power to’ transform natural resources. Fiske and Berdahl (2007) problematises the definition of power as effect because this only tells ‘what power does’, and leaves ‘what power is’ unclear. The combination of ‘power to’ and ‘power over’ succinctly indicates both the ability a power provides its possessor and the effect caused by the ability to exercise that power. Therefore, ‘power to’ and ‘power over’ are the conceptions of causal relationships.

The manifestation of power, nevertheless, may not, in reality, be as straightforward as in the example of artificial pond. For this reason, there are different ways in which social scientists possibly detect power in the absence of its obvious performance or operation. Let me re-visit Lukes’ (2005) thinking on the third dimension of power. By this, he indicated hidden enactments of power. Power lurks beneath the surface.

In the last section, this point was further discussed with Bourdieu's (2006, 1990, 1986) idea of capitals. The variation in capitals suggested that power may turn into different forms, and hence is manifested differently. It is therefore imprudent to overestimate 'power over' as a concept that perfectly manifests 'power to'. Another potential limitation of 'power over' is suggested in Parsons' (1957) criticism about Mills (1956). The concept of 'power over' connotes one's domination over others. As Parsons (1957) pointed out, however, such zero-sum sense of a completely imbalanced power relationship is not the one and only model of power operation. Whilst domination incorporates a presumed negativity in itself, power can function positively. In this light, it is necessary to carefully re-consider the quality of power, and is equally important to pay scholarly attention to acceptable forms of power.

3.3.3. Domination, authority and legitimacy

In this subsection, I initially explain Hearn's warning about solely considering domination as a model of power operation, and his emphasis on authority and legitimacy. Once I have offered some basic explanation of authority and legitimacy, I will introduce other supplemental sources and theorists to discuss the rule-boundedness of authority, type of authority, geography of authority and the difference between objective and subjective legitimacy.

Hearn (2012) critically points out the tendency to presume domination as a form of power. This is partially because domination is based upon an imbalanced power distribution between the powerful and the powerless, and also because social scientists pay attention to power when its usage is problematised. His claim is along the lines of Parsons (1957) who criticises Mills' (1956) sole focus on domination as the power model. Power enacting underneath our daily lives is so complex that the simplified the ruler-the ruled relationship is not the only model of power relationship. Moreover, power is not necessarily taken negatively, and can function positively (Hearn, 2012; Parsons, 1957). It is therefore important to consider more nuanced and subtle power operations that are inappropriate to be categorised as domination. Hearn (2012) suggests that the comprehensive and deeper analysis of power cannot be achieved unless authority and legitimacy are taken into consideration.

Authority is a valid and accepted form of capability “to make commands and have them obeyed” (Hearn, 2012: 23). At least in theory, there cannot be authority without legitimation. For example, in the literature review, I briefly described that in mid-16th century Scotland, legislation forced those who owned lands worth more than one hundred pounds (Scots pounds) to plant woods or orchards around their houses. The landowners were forced to satisfy the increasing interest in the preservation of the forests no matter whether they were willing or not. The enforcement was however legislated, and hence the government’s sanction and power exercise was a legitimate authority. It is essentially important for power possessors to legitimise his or her power so that it turns into authority. As a commonly approved way to legitimise power relationships, Hearn (2013, 2012) suggests competition. Competitions are held in ritual manners so that one’s superiority over others is systematically defined. According to Swedberg and Agevall (2005), there are different ‘ideal types’ of ritualised competition. One is to define power relationships by votes from a concerned constituency. One possible example of this is garden visiting because the popularity of a garden, or its ‘power to’ attract the general public, is proportional to the number of visitors. Another type is to define one’s powerfulness by experts’ judgements. This is illustrated by gardening awards officially authorised by horticultural associations to the garden owners or designers. Whichever the type of ritualised competition is, power is legitimised and turns into authority where its quality is judged in reasonable ways.

As demonstrated thus far, authority and legitimacy usually act in unison. Nevertheless, as Hearn (2012) emphasises, authority itself is rule-bounded, and could possibly lose its legitimacy. Various charitable bodies have the right to collect money in different ways. For example, a charitable organisation that aims to conserve historic houses and gardens charges entrance fees to such properties. However, it is not impossible, for all parties involved in the management of their historic properties, or for stakeholders, to misappropriate the profits gained. Of course, this would be an illegitimate use of power. The loss of legitimacy is also well exemplified by guerrilla gardens. As explained elsewhere, its defining characteristic is the unpermitted cultivation of public terrains. The lands the guerrilla gardeners dig, weed, plant and

water do not belong to them. In this light, their exertion of physical ‘power to’ turn public spaces into gardens is illegitimate, and would seldom be recognised as authoritative. It is implicated from this that the ownership of land is an important theme when investigating the legitimacy of power exercised in gardens.

As explained earlier, legitimacy is fundamentally the precondition for authority. If, however, authority loses its legitimacy, is it no longer labelled authority? There are possible exceptions to which the principle that authority is legitimate power is not applicable. This point can be further examined by Wrong’s (2002) typology of authority, which includes legitimate authority, coercive authority, authority by inducement, competent authority and private authority. ‘Legitimate authority’ agrees with the basic rule that authority is legitimate power. It is legally accepted and hence has a reasonable and consensual control over others. Legitimate authority, on the other hand, implies that Wrong (2002) is very much of the opinion that authority can be illegitimate. ‘Coercive authority’ more clearly explains that illegitimate power could still be authority. If A coercively obtains B’s compliance by threatening the latter with force, A’s ‘power over’ B is hardly seen as legitimate but there is still room for the power to be authoritative. It is difficult to exemplify coercive authority in garden-related contexts, but master-servant relationships in ancient times might be a prototype of this kind because servants were literally forced and threatened by their master to physically labour to create a garden.

In contrast to such disapproved, unjust and forceful manipulation, authority can be persuasive requests for co-operation. ‘Authority by inducement’ is a sort of power exercise that gains negotiated compliance, sometimes by offering rewards (Wrong, 2002). One possible demonstration of this is an American celebration of Arbor Day. In America, several charitable bodies legally charge for the purchase of trees to celebrate Arbor Day. They persuasively request donations by claiming the importance of trees, green campaigns and their positive effects on the environment or education. Such a charity model is authorised because donators are not compelled, but induced to make monetary contributions to Arbor Day. Nye (2004) shows a similar view as that of Wrong (2002) by introducing the concept of ‘soft power’.

This is a form of power operation that gains the agreements or co-operation of those over which power is exercised by offering what they want. By doing so, Ney further explains, the power holder can eventually materialise what they pursue as an ultimate goal. Both authority by inducement and soft power are an indirect ‘power over’ others and a tacit exercise ‘power to’ ensure successful results without prompting others uncooperative or angry responses.

Another type of authority Wrong (2002) suggests is ‘competent authority’, which is to justify one’s authority out of a belief that its possessor specialises in a specific subject and has acclaimed skills and knowledge. One of its possible garden-related illustrations may be a suggestion made by a botanical adviser working in a local garden centre. The advice drives the amateur gardener to trust the adviser because there is a common perception or belief that those who work in garden centres are knowledgeable about plants. Wrong (2002) clearly differentiates competent authority from the actual possession of specialised knowledge of skills, and emphasises on the subject’s belief that the power exerciser have specialised knowledge and skills. As he puts it, “‘competent authority’ in this sense is not at all the same thing as authority based on ‘technical’ competence... I mean here by ‘competent authority’ authority that rests solely on the subject’s belief in the superior knowledge or skill of the exerciser... “(Wrong, 2002: 53). This view is indicative of the importance of subjectivity, rather than objectively qualified traits, when judging the legitimacy of one’s power exercise.

Wrong (2002) also suggests ‘personal authority’ as one of the types of authority. Its legitimacy is unquestioned and approved as a matter of course because of pre-established personal relationships. Wrong (2002) emphasises that personal authority is characterised by non-institutionalised role relationships. By this, he means that one’s authority is not drawn from socially defined traits such as Chief Executive. As a typical example of this, he takes the relationship between the loved one and the lover who act in accordance with the declaration of ‘your wish is my command’. One possible illustration of this might be an inheritance of a country house and garden from a father and its maintenance in the testator’s will. As has been shown, Wrong’s

(2002) typology suggests a wide variety of authority. The meaning of authority is not definitive – it does not necessarily denote coercion of absolute powerful individuals, but can connote an essence of negotiation and acquiescence. Wrong's typology indicates grey areas of authority, but first and foremost highlights that authority can be illegitimate. For this reason, it is crucial to consider more carefully the possible ways in which power holders maintain its legitimacy.

One way to achieve or strengthen legitimacy of one's power would be to announce its possessor's integrity to the public; this way is closely associated with the geography of authority. As Bulkeley (2012) explains with the concept of 'private authority', authority exercised in a domestic sphere can be legitimised by 'public recognition'. Charitable organisations usually hold their Annual General Meeting once a year, and report the integrity of their internal governance to outside supporters. The impact and effectiveness of this 'public recognition' could be rationalised by examining cases where there is not accredited outsider's recognition. Along the lines of Bulkeley's distinction, Cashore's (2002) emphasis on 'external audiences' in the privatisation of governance also reminds us of the importance of acceptance granted from the outside sphere. Acceptability of power, or whether it turns into authority, in part depends on the public awareness. Notwithstanding this basic rule that one's authority is valid inside his or her own domestic sphere, the distinction between the private and the public might be no longer sustainable in Open Gardens where random strangers can come into one's estate. The relationship between garden owners and visitors may therefore be one of the contexts in which a difference in the perception of legitimacy is noticeable.

The debate on authority and legitimacy raises the perception of power as an important theme, and this point is closely associated with the distinction between objectivity and subjectivity of legitimacy. Just as the definition of authority is vague, legitimacy may also be too ambiguous to operate as a precondition for authority. The Cambridge Online Dictionary tells that it means legality and acceptability, but one's legal actions might not be perceived to be acceptable. Fuchs (2011) explains that legitimacy is defined both objectively and subjectively. 'Objective legitimacy' refers

to legally approved status although ‘subjective legitimacy’ rests upon people’s perceptions. Again, this is exemplified by the aforementioned contemporary gardening practice called guerrilla gardening. One of its earliest examples was Californian citizens’ resistance against the University of California’s decision to convert a park into a parking lot (Baudry, 2012). This conversion was not felt by the general public to be acceptable. Beetham (2013) shares a similar view to that of Fuchs (2011), and outlines two basic meanings of legitimacy: legal validity and moral justifiability. Legitimacy is defined primarily as legal validity – power is legitimate where its justifiability is supported by established laws. When legitimacy is understood as legal validity, judgement on legitimate or illegitimate is very clear-cut and objective. Legitimacy is also involved in some contexts of moral justifiability – power is legitimate where its possession and exercise are perceived to be morally defensible, acceptable or rightful. Whatever the terminology, both Fuchs (2011) and Beetham (2013) suggest the ambiguity of legitimacy.

The difference between objective and subjective legitimacy (Fuchs, 2011) is to some extent connected with the type of institution. Scott (2014) identifies ‘regulative institution’ and ‘cultural-cognitive institution’ as major types to which the difference in the basis of legitimacy corresponds. In regulative institutions, legitimacy is regularised and rule-defined although in cultural cognitive counterpart legitimacy rests upon taken-for-grantedness, consensual perceptions and pre-established common sense. Rule-defined legitimacy of regulative institutions makes sense to outsiders, and hence is objective. Conversely, legitimacy that is taken for granted in cultural-cognitive institutions might be perceived by outsiders to be unreasonable. This is certainly a reminder of Bulkeley’s (2012) concept of ‘private authority’. Theorists and their thoughts on authority and legitimacy all indicate that power is seen as legitimate and successfully turn into authority in particular bounded-contexts.

As noted at the beginning of this subsection, authority and legitimacy remind us that domination is not the only form of power operation. Throughout this subsection, it has been demonstrated that there are complexities surrounding the meaning of authority and legitimacy. Whilst authority and legitimacy would be one way of

considering the nature of power, they are not a black-and-white subject, but rather incorporate many grey areas in themselves. Inspired by different theorists, I examined four themes that typify the ambiguity of authority and legitimacy: the rule-boundedness of authority (Hearn, 2012), type of authority (Wrong, 2002), geography of authority (Bulkeley, 2012) and the difference between objective and subjective legitimacy (Fuchs, 2012). Authority is not necessarily legitimate (Koppell, 2008; Wrong, 2002). Legitimacy may therefore not be the one and only precondition for authority in some contexts. Ultimately, legitimacy is context-sensitive (Beetham, 2013), and its nature is not definitive, but rather variable. What is regarded as legitimate or authoritative varies from situation to situation. Legitimacy is a highly contested concept, as its definition is often fluid depending upon a liberal democratic order, convention, morality and other kinds of factors surrounding it (Stout, 2013). All in all, authority and legitimacy are multifaceted concepts that require researchers to carefully consider what they mean in a specific context under investigation.

3.3.4. Revisiting ANT

In addition to the aforementioned key concepts (physical versus social power, ‘power to’ versus ‘power over’ and the trilogy of domination, authority and legitimacy), I also would like to note Hearn’s (2012) disagreement with ANT. He mentions ANT as one of the ‘epistemological approaches’ to power, and implicitly considers it to be unconvincing. Hearn’s criticism of ANT is reasonably illuminated by considering his reaction to its symmetrical treatment of humans and non-humans. To be precise, he does not utterly deny that non-humans can be treated as agents. Indeed, where he explains his thought on power and agents, it is noted that in the broadest sense agent refers to anything that is able to carry out alterations to a series of events, but the common sense shared amongst social scientists is to limit agents to humans (Hearn, 2012: 9-13). What he disagrees with is thus the claim that social scientists can or should treat non-humans as agents and research them. Strictly speaking, agent is not identical to agency as the latter refers to the former’s intentionality; what conventionally qualifies agency is, as explained earlier in 3.2.5, therefore humans and intentionality, and Hearn supports this conventional understanding of agency, as he states that “human intentionality is definitional of agency (and I would agree)” (Hearn, 2012: 93).

Hearn's agreement with human-intentionality as the defining characteristic of agency spills over into the scepticism about ANT's attempt to transcend the boundary between social science and natural science. In other words, he raises doubt about the view that social scientists should analyse non-human agents through the same analytical lenses as the ones typically used for human agents. His belief that non-human agents should be studied exclusively by natural scientists is well demonstrated by the quotation below.

ANT presents various conceptual problems. There is a tension between the call to make no methodological distinction between the material and the ideal, the human and the non-human, and the manifest focus on human behaviour. This would seem to imply that there is something specific about humans that interests us, and if so, why not have methods and perspectives specific to studying them? (Hearn, 2012: 94-95)

It is essential to keep in mind that Hearn conceptualises power in the political, social and economic context as other theorists of power have conventionally done. Hence, his conceptualisation might face limitations when being used to analyse contexts in which power of both humans and non-humans is intertwined, or academic fields in which social and natural sciences are expected to assemble together, such as geography. Hearn's (2012) standpoint is paradoxical because he starts his conceptualisation by including the importance of physical power, and exemplifies it by referring to the power of natural disasters such as a volcano. In this light, despite its adequacy as an analytical tool, his conceptualisation should not be overestimated, as there may be contexts that it cannot entirely explain.

3.4. Chapter summary

This chapter has presented different discourses on power and Jonathan Hearn's conceptualisation of power. In the first part of this chapter, I initially described Marx and Weber as theorists who formed the basis of today's power discourses. Their fundamental notions of power as one's capability to affect others and as the traditional domination model have still played the locus role. I then described Pareto, Mosca and Gramsci as figures whose major concern was to question where power exists in the hierarchical social system. This led to Hunter, Mills and Parsons who

further addressed the location of power in society and cast doubt on the assumed domination model. I then recounted Lukes, Bourdieu and Foucault who reconsidered the uncertainty over where power is located and the ways in which we can identify power where it is tacitly enacting. I also offered an overview of Actor-Network-Theory with some explanation of how its founders Latour and Callon influenced the long-lasting debate about agency. Even though the traditional understanding of agency is based upon the principle of human-intentionality, they argued that non-humans should be treated as agents that can exercise power.

In the latter part of this chapter, Hearn's (2012) power framework was introduced as a principal theoretical framework with which I will contextualise my findings. The primary reason for the selection of his theory has been that he considers not only social power to which social scientists have paid sufficient attention, but also physical power that is performed as a matter of course in garden-related leisure pursuits. This point suggested a possibility that power can be used as an analytical framework beyond the political, social and economic contexts in which it has traditionally been debated. Another rationale behind the selection of Hearn's conceptualisation was that it encapsulates various existing debates on power. Theorists discussed in the last section were mentioned again where appropriate because Hearn's framework considers existing debates over power. The distinction between 'power to' and 'power over' illuminated who or what holds power and who or what is affected by the power held. 'Power over' could also indicate one's domination over another. It was pointed out, however, that domination is not the only form of power operation. Authority and legitimacy were therefore explored to draw a wider picture. Since authority is legitimate power, legitimacy is basically understood as the precondition for authority. In reality, however, authority is not necessarily legitimate, and legitimacy might be too ambivalent to be a prerequisite for authority. Its meaning varies from situation to situation. Therefore, it is necessary to flexibly consider the context-sensitiveness of authority and legitimacy.

Open Gardens may be a unique phenomenon in which both physical power and social power inseparably operate. The above-explained concepts are expected to

function as the basis of theoretical analysis. However, as implied above, there might also be cases that Hearn's (2012) conceptualisation cannot completely explain. This is expected to be notable where power of both humans and non-humans are inextricably entangled together. As explained earlier, Hearn (2012) is sceptical about ANT because of its symmetrical treatment of humans and non-humans as agents that are capable to exercise power. In keeping with these potential consequences, it is indicated that his power conceptualisation might incorporate some limitations, and hence is possibly unable to explain some aspects of Open Gardens. Therefore, the findings chapters will be subject to, in part, examining which existing approaches, including Hearn's (2012), to power is applicable, or inapplicable, to Open Gardens.

Chapter 4: Methodology

4.1. Introduction

In this chapter, I primarily account for the paradigmatic premises that inform this research. Its main thread is the converse of positivistic standpoints that underpinned most of the previous studies on garden opening. This research was therefore underpinned by interpretivism and constructivism. Detailed rationales behind this decision will be explained in the next section on research paradigm. What is noteworthy in this introduction is that those philosophical standpoints are closely associated with, and aligned with, reflexivity (McIlveen, 2008). Alvesson and Sköldböck (2009) explain at the outset of their work *Reflexive Methodology* that reflexive research is characterised by two ideas: careful interpretation and reflection. The first term suggests that all data generated from research respondents are the result of *their* interpretation. The second term is concerned with the ‘interpretation of interpretation’ – thus researchers who premise their research upon interpretivism and constructivism also function as one of the interpreters in reflexive research. Researchers investigate multiple realities, by which I mean the world differently interpreted by research respondents, and then further interpret the respondents’ realities. Careful interpretations and reflections are therefore ideas that indicate the two contrasting and complementary levels of interpretation. In order to differentiate research respondents’ interpretation from *my own* interpretation, I make descriptions in the first person form in this thesis, particularly in the findings chapters in which the two kinds of interpretations are both reported.

After explaining the underpinning paradigm of the present research, this chapter covers the practical aspects of data generation including research design, sampling, data collection and data analysis. As with the selection of the research paradigm, I chose different methods from those used by previous studies on garden openings, namely qualitative approaches, with the aim of unveiling new themes, or of scrutinising previously identified themes more deeply. The use of qualitative methods is suggested by Connell (2002) who, as reported in Chapter 2, conducted one of the most notable empirical studies in this area. I wanted to obtain deep and experiential engagement with the people and places of my research, and hence chose to interact face-to-face with different kinds of people who were present in Open

Gardens. In this light, fieldwork was the primary method of my data generation. Accordingly, multicase study design, purposive sampling methods, participant observation, semi-structured interview and qualitative data analysis were employed. Ultimately, these procedures harmonise with my paradigmatic principles: interpretivism and constructivism.

4.2. Research paradigm

A paradigm is defined as “a cluster of beliefs and dictates that for scientists in a particular discipline influence what should be studied, how research should be done, and how results should be interpreted” (Bryman, 2016: 694). Walliman (2006) guides us through two ways to acquire knowledge: one is empiricism that gains knowledge by sensory experience and inductive reasoning, and another is rationalism that gains knowledge by deductive reasoning. The origin of paradigmatic debates might have featured such a simple dualism. The dichotomous paradigm war between quantitative and qualitative (or positivist versus anti-positivist) was partly resolved by the emergence of the mixed method paradigm, but there have also been other paradigm wars between competing post-positivist, constructivist and critical theory paradigms, and between evidence-based methodologists and the mixed methods, interpretive, and critical theory schools (Denzin, 2010). These multiple paradigmatic disputes indicate a chaotic situation in which there is no consensus in the definition and classification of existing paradigms.

Whilst the classification made by Lincoln and Guba (2000) and its revised version made by Lincoln, Lynham and Guba (2011) seem to have been a commonly employed guideline on paradigmatic selection, I do not follow this. This is because I am not convinced by ‘the naturalist paradigm’ advocated by them (Guba and Lincoln, 1982; Lincoln and Guba, 1985). This is defined as a “discovery-oriented approach that minimizes investigator manipulation of the study setting and places no prior constraints on what the outcomes of the research will be” (Patton, 2002: 39). One of its defining characters, as expressed in the above definition, is its inductiveness: naturalistic inquiries are guided by generated data. This agrees with, as I shall account for in detail later, the way in which data gathered from my fieldwork were

analysed. In other words, data were inductively analysed without using any previously built code lists. Nevertheless, this research has also been oriented by the literature I have read. In this light, my mind was not a *tabula rasa* when I started data collection and analysis. The difference between inductiveness and deductiveness is not a black-and-white issue: they are not easily separable, and inductive and deductive approaches often go hand in hand in practical research procedures (Schadewitz and Jachna, 2007). Because of its sole emphasis on inductiveness, the naturalist paradigm and the classification made by Guba and Lincoln were not used in this research.

The paradigmatic underpinning of this research is explained below by dividing it into two levels: epistemology and ontology. Epistemology is a branch of philosophy that is concerned with how we know things (Bernard, 2000; Lund and Suthers, 2013). Epistemological discussions are thus about the ways in which researchers approach knowledge. Ontology is defined as “A concept concerned with the existence of, and relationship between different aspects of society, such as social actors, cultural norms and social structures” (Barron, 2009: 203-204). To express this more simply, ontology is to discuss the nature of reality (Punch, 2013). Epistemology and ontology are of central importance to paradigmatic decisions as they are the elements that provide the conduct of research with its shape and definition (Tuli, 2010).

This research was guided by interpretivism and constructivism as epistemological and ontological premises respectively. The pair of interpretivism and constructivism assume multiple subjective realities constructed in individuals’ minds (Ponterotto, 2005), and have typically been used to underpin qualitative research. Subjectivity and multiplicity are defining characteristics of interpretivism and constructivism respectively. The following subsections explain the rationale behind the selection of interpretivism in the first instance, and then moves on to the reasoning behind the selection of constructivism. I also explain, where appropriate, why other alternatives to these paradigmatic standpoints were not chosen.

4.2.1. Epistemological position

Whilst there is a bundle of epistemological traditions, this current research was

guided by interpretivism. Interpretivists are concerned with how people interpret the world, and believe that reality is not objectively defined, but is socially constructed (Decrop, 2004). One of the intellectual legacies of interpretivism is the theological concept of *hermeneutics* (Gadamer, 1976; von Wright, 1971). Semantically, the term originates from Hermes, an ancient Greek (mythological) god who was in charge of making clear messages between gods (Thompson, 1990). When applied to social sciences, hermeneutics refers to a theoretical framework that is concerned with the interpretive understanding of research objects (Patton, 2002). Hermeneutics aims to transcend mere superficial descriptions of human behaviour, and to unveil hidden meaning of human experience and relations (Lopez and Wills, 2004). Another heritage of interpretivism is Max Weber's idea of *verstehen* that is the idea of understanding the causal explanation of studied phenomena through interpretive understanding of social action (Bryman, 2016). Weber believes that sociology is a discourse that discovers meaningful characters of social actions through understanding [*verstehen*] (Weber, 1947), and this stance sits in opposition to quantitative approaches used by natural scientists (Chowdhury, 2014). The aim of *verstehen* is directly related to subjective meanings of human action in society, as Weber states that "In 'action' is included all human behaviour when and in so far as the acting individual attaches a subjective meaning to it [sic]" (1947: 80). Leitch, Hill and Harrison (2010) note that interpretivists' quest for *verstehen* is to try to capture "the actual meanings and interpretations that actors subjectively ascribe to phenomena" (70). In short, interpretivism, the meaning of which is deepened by hermeneutics and *verstehen*, is an epistemological standpoint that is concerned with people's interpretation of the social world, and the subjective meanings and understandings hidden in their experiences and relations to others.

Interpretivism is a suitable epistemological position from which to examine garden openers and their associates' perspectives. While the previous studies on garden opening have reported findings as results of questionnaire surveys and structured interviews, data gained from them are not descriptive and, as such, are limited in their capacity to understand what the respondents actually think at anything more than a superficial level. For example, sharing the garden with other people has been

identified as an important motivation for opening a garden to the public (Connell, 2005; Lipovská, 2013; Ryan and Bates, 1995). However, what the respondents intended to share is not specified. Realistically, ownership of a garden cannot be shared with randomly encountered strangers. The same term might be cited by different individuals to express different meanings. To shed light on such potential subtlety hidden in the respondents' remarks, it was necessary to pay attention to their subjectivity.

As there are numerous other epistemological standpoints, I would like to note the reason why interpretivism seems most suitable, and why other different, albeit similar, epistemological perspectives would not. Another alternative to positivism that I considered was phenomenology. Some characteristics of interpretivism overlap with those of phenomenology. Kelliher (2011) refers to Husserl (1965), who is known as an advocate of phenomenology, as a theorist who believes that reality is an outcome of social construction. As noted earlier, this is also the belief of interpretivists. Phenomenology can also be characterised by hermeneutics and *verstehen* (Aitchison, 2003). Whilst the boundary between interpretivism and phenomenology might be vague, my preference is for interpretivism rather than phenomenology. This is because one of the salient features of phenomenology is bracketing which was developed from Husserl's idea of *epoché* (Hamill and Sinclair, 2010). The concept of bracketing emphasises that individual cases should be investigated without being influenced by preconceived ideas (Flood, 2010). As Husserl (1965) indicates in his claim that philosophy is a science as rigorous as natural sciences, the concept of bracketing (*epoché*) is derived from mathematics in which there is no room for researchers to employ subjectivity. Whilst bracketing is an objection against biased approaches to a research topic, it is inconsistent with the way in which this current research has been developed. A body of literature that I consulted before starting this PhD has certainly shaped my preconceptions about Open Gardens and determined the direction of this research. Especially, as noted in the Introduction, the concept of conspicuous consumption drove me to concentrate on the display of status or achievement although there might have been other important themes regarding Open Gardens. The technique of bracketing aims to

comprehend pure phenomenal experiences that are untouched by any presumptions, but has been contested because of the lack of practical suggestion of ways to achieve scientific rigour (Le Vasseur, 2003). Since there is a mismatch between the aim of bracketing and the way in which this research has practically evolved, phenomenology as an epistemological position was discounted.

4.2.2. Ontological position

I now account for the rationale behind constructivism that is the ontological position of this research. Constructivism originates from attempts to understand the nature of reality (Andrews, 2012). Unlike objectivism that presupposes the existence of a single reality, constructivism is characterised by its assertion of multiple realities, and by its attempt to understand the multiple realities that people have or construct in their minds (Patton, 2002). This stance supports this research which is concerned with how different parties involved in Open Gardens construct their own realities. For constructivists, truth is not objectively defined, but is rather perceived as a consensual understanding of the world among parties concerned in a specific context (Burr, 2015). Constructivism is therefore not the pursuance of ultimate truthfulness, but assumes ontological relativity and absence of certainty in any state of affairs (Botterill, 2014; Hawkins, 2012; Rodwell, 2015). Constructivism is therefore summarised as an ontological perspective characterised by the presumption of multiple realities constructed in human minds and of the fluidity and relativity of truthfulness.

Constructivism also asserts that meanings of studied social phenomena are never definitive and determinate because they are continually accomplished by social actors and hence are in a constant state of revision (Bryman, 2016). For constructivists, knowledge generated by the researcher is a human construction, and is never definitive (Lee, 2012). This notion of constructivism illustrates the necessity to revisit and possibly update previous findings. Let me explain this point by raising scepticism about theoretical saturation which is the concept that typically supports the sampling procedure of grounded theory. Whilst theoretical saturation has been widely accepted as the point where nothing new can be found, there has been no consensus on what it actually means and how it can be achieved (Bowen, 2008).

Theoretical saturation does generally not consider the temporality of the research outcome. Even if one reaches a specific conclusion, different results may be drawn sometime later. Even within the same subject, it needs to be repeatedly re-examined because previously generated knowledge might no longer be accurate or valid. Open Gardens have been researched previously, but it is valuable to keep the previously generated knowledge up-to-date and be open to the possibility of other ways of seeing, knowing and researching.

I generally agree with constructivism, with its presupposition of multiple realities existing in individuals' minds and of knowledge fluidity. However, as a supplementary comment, there is also an aspect that might be slightly unsuitable for this research. According to Bryman (2012), constructivism is premised on Guba's (1990) notion that the social world is fundamentally different from the natural or physical world. In the context of those who open private gardens to the public, it is questionable whether the social and the natural world are completely separated. Garden owners intentionally modify their natural settings, and their perceptions and actions are influenced by nature. The social and natural worlds are rather more closely intertwined than previous research has assumed. As such, I will operate from a standpoint where there are not always clear boundaries between the natural and the social. In this light, this research's ontological position is distinguished from social constructionism. Whilst constructivism and social constructionism are often used interchangeably, Young and Collin (2004) distinguish constructivism whose focus is individual cognitive engagements in the construction of knowledge from social constructionism that claims that the knowledge is historically and culturally constructed through the social process and behaviour. Crotty (1998) construes 'social' constructionism as a perception that "All reality, as meaningful reality, is socially constructed. There is no exception" (54). Because of this over-emphasis on the social, social constructionism as an ontological position was discounted.

In order to further strengthen the justification for the selection of interpretivism and constructivism, I explain the reason why positivism, which lies in opposition to my paradigmatic position, is not adequate for this research. I have already noted

elsewhere that the existing studies on garden openings have shown a bias in favour of quantitative methods. According to Easterby-Smith, Richard and Paul (2012), positivism, one of the epistemological traditions on which quantitative research is usually premised, consists of eight characteristics: independence (of observer), value-freedom, causality, hypothesis and deduction, operationalization, reductionism, generalisation and cross-sectional analysis. However, these eight characteristics have met with criticism in the field of leisure studies. Aitchison (2003) offers two reasons for this. Firstly, reductionism presupposes that parts of a system are unrelated elements and are free from the impacts of external factors. It is doubtful whether data can be gathered from humans without being influenced by other social actors (Aitchison, 2003). An example of this can be seen from Datta (2016) who conducted a five year autoethnography on a Canadian community garden. He successfully observed how community gardeners (including himself) interacted with each other, how such interactions developed community in the garden, and how the garden becomes an informal, interactive and relational opportunity for children, young people and parents to learn about environmental issues such as food security. Mutual influences between people, or the inquirer and the inquired, have been taken for granted both in societies and in the field of social sciences.

As the second critique of positivism in leisure studies, positivism assumes that objective information is always available and can be collected in an objective manner. There are arguably many areas of leisure, sport and tourism, or of culture more broadly, where the access to data is limited (Aitchison, 2003). This is primarily because one's leisure activities are often hidden and not easily observable. The concepts of privatism and secrecy have historically been central issues of domestic enclosed gardens (Black, 2011). Bhatti et al. (2014) analysed narrative accounts of today's British amateur gardeners, and report their desire for privacy and secrecy secure from the gaze of the neighbours or the public. Private gardens are therefore by their very nature places in which interruptions of others are supposed to be minimised, and places to which outsiders cannot easily approach. Blackshaw (2010) claims that studying leisure is an interpretive endeavour – leisure lives internalise aspects pertaining to secrecy in themselves, and we leisure scholars can only attempt

to render their meanings. Blackshaw further explains that one of the key elements of leisure pursuits is the great playfulness of the human mind, such as happiness or pleasure. The nature of leisure study is thus to explore human subjectivity. Positivism is not adequate for this research, or for leisure studies more generally, because it dismisses interactions between people involved in studied phenomena, and is unsuitable for unveiling hidden human behaviours and for interpreting human subjectivity.

This section explained how I selected epistemological and ontological standpoints of this research. Interpretivism was chosen as the epistemological position of this research in order to understand respondents' interpretations and subjective meanings. Phenomenology and naturalist paradigm were also considered as they share similarities with interpretivism, but were rejected in the end because they discount researchers' impacts upon settings or objects under investigation and also because their emphasis is solely on inductiveness. In terms of ontology, constructivism was selected to investigate multiple realities that garden openers and their associates construct in their minds. Constructivism is the most appropriate ontology for addressing this specific research issue because of its presupposition that different individuals perceive the world differently. Despite adopting a constructivist ontology, I doubted whether the distinction between the social and natural world is as straightforward as constructivists believe it to be, particularly in the context of Open Gardens. In keeping with the above discussions regarding the epistemological and ontological underpinnings of this research, I will now start gradually narrowing down the focus to more practical aspects of the ways in which I generated data.

4.3. Research design

This research is designed as a 'multicase study'. It is a form of case study that investigates multiple cases and aims to understand both differences and commonalities amongst the cases under investigation (Bogdan and Biklen, 2007; Stake, 2006). In this section, I recount why this design was chosen, by contextualising the rationale behind the choice with existing debates within the case study literature, namely its definition and generalisability. While case study is a ubiquitously used research design, there is a debate about what it actually means

(Tight, 2010). Abercrombie, Hill and Turner define it as follows.

The detailed examination of a single example of a class of phenomena, a case study cannot provide reliable information about the broader class, but it may be useful in the preliminary stages of an investigation since it provides hypotheses, which may be tested systematically with a larger number of cases. (Abercrombie, Hill and Turner, 1984: 34)

This dated definition seems to me contestable because it includes several existing controversies over the use of case study. Firstly, it is not clear whether case studies are used to investigate single cases only. Clarifying this point also requires us to consider the definition of 'case' because 'a single case' can widely vary depending on its scale. Cases can be people, a group or groups of people or occasions although activities are seldom identified as cases (Stake, 2006). Secondly, it is uncertain whether or not case study is only for generating hypotheses at a preliminary stage of inquiry (Yin, 2009). This questions whether a single case is applicable to other cases, and hence leads to the matter of generalisation. Positioning this research as a case study would require some consideration of these two points.

I deal with the definition of 'case' in the first instance. A 'case' is defined by Miles and Huberman (1994) as "a phenomenon of some sort occurring in a bounded context" (25). The phrase 'bounded context' may have caused controversy. One common interpretation of 'bounded context' is time (Gomm, Hammersly and Foster, 2000). Whether longitudinal or not, research is generally conducted during a specific period of time. Even though a case study commonly connotes the investigation of contemporary phenomena (Yin, 2014), a case study can be used for historical inquiries. When used for historical purposes, cases are events that happened in the past prior to present inferences being studied (Thomas, 2016). Another possible 'bounded context' that is most frequently associated with the usage of 'case' is the location (Bryman, 2012). It is common for titles of case studies to have names of specific localities. This research corresponds to both kinds of 'bounded context'. The object of this research is contemporary Scottish Open Gardens. However, this description would not be enough to precisely grasp what has been regarded as a 'case' in this study because both 'contemporary' and 'Scotland' refer to contexts that are

too lengthy and too broad. It is true that my research duration and location were limited, as they neither covered the whole ‘contemporary’ period nor the entire country of Scotland. In short, both time and location are useful to gain a rough idea of what a case is, but neither of them enables researchers to specify when and where exactly a case study is carried out.

For the reason stated above, further specificity and boundedness are required for the definition of ‘case’, precisely because a case has to be a specific entity (Stake, 1995). A case, in this research, is regarded as an Open Garden. One might argue that the entire organisation of Scottish Open Garden in the 2014 season should be seen as a case. Arguably, since each Open Garden has widely differing characteristics, it is appropriate to identify each Open Garden as a single case. This stance addresses a semantic problem case studies tend to face. The very meaning of the term ‘case’ has a connotation that what it refers to is a case of the general categories (Gomm et al., 2000). Thomas (2016) explains this point by using a metaphor of suitcase. According to him, the English term ‘case’ etymologically originates from a Latin word ‘*caspa*’ that means ‘container’. A container is seen as a general case that contains things within it. An excellent example of this is a suitcase. A suitcase is bounded – once its latches are clipped, it is completely shut and distinguished from the outer world. However, it contains other stuff whose characteristics differ, such as a T-shirt, a tooth brush, flip-flops, maps, souvenirs and so on. This metaphor demonstrates that it is misleading to collectively define a general category, which incorporates a number of subcategories in itself, as a single case because a variety of attributes that characterises each sub-category are dismissed. Following this notion, I treated each Open Garden as a single case so that their different features were taken into consideration. To be precise, I visited some Open Gardens twice or three times. Whilst it was possible to count each visit as a case, a repeat visit to the same garden was considered as a same case. This is because the garden had consistently existed no matter when I visited it.

Another common debate about case study research is generalisability. Generalisation is “a logical argument for extending one’s claims beyond the data” (Steinberg, 2015:

153). There appears to be a deep-seated and long-lasting belief that case studies cannot be generalised (Kennedy, 1979). Contrary to the arguments against case studies' generalisability, there is also a view that the knowledge gained from case studies can be used to deepen understandings of other related phenomena (Gomm et al., 2000; Flyvbjerg, 2006; Williams, 2002). Whilst I do not overrate the generalisability of the present research, I do expect it to achieve a minor level of generalisability. Generalisation is a matter of degree, instead of a binary judgement (Kennedy, 1979). Stake (1995) introduces the ideas of *petite generalization* and *grand generalization* to explain the difference in the degree to which knowledge discovered from case studies is transferable; the former refers to a less wide range of generalisability than that of the latter. It is unlikely that the findings of this research will universally explain any kinds of sociological issues, but they can be transferrable to other garden-related contexts, charity fundraising events, touristic pursuits in which power underlies relationships between human beings and nature and leisure experiences in which the display or indication of status is evident.

Relevance is a crucial criterion when judging a research study's generalisability. This is because knowledge discovered as a result of a case study is likely to be transferrable to other similar contexts out of its context-dependency (Flyvbjerg, 2006; Kennedy, 1979). Findings regarding perspectives of the staff of SG might enlighten other researchers who work on other nature-related charities such as the National Trust, but are unlikely to explain perspectives of those who work in business sectors or commercial profit-oriented organisations. In short, I challenge the deep-seated assumption that case studies are not generalisable. The generalisations of this research's findings will have limitations, however, they will be relevant and applicable to those researching leisure and tourism pursuits that share similar attributes to those of today's Scottish Open Gardens. In addition, there may potentially be other contexts of which the findings of this research can be transferred. Taber (2010) suggests that in matters concerning judgement on generalisability, the onus is partially on the readers. Similarly, Dzakiria (2012) recommends extending the responsibility for generalisability to readers or other researchers. Readers of this thesis might be aware of a wider diversity of contexts that can be illuminated by the

findings of this research. For these reasons, it is unreasonable to completely deny the generalisability of this research before it is read by others.

This section recounted the selection of multicase study as the research design, and discussed two typical controversies over case study: definition of ‘case’ and generalisation. Despite the fact that time and location have been used as bounded contexts that define ‘a case’, it has been unclear to what degree both of them need to be specific to define ‘case’. In this research, each Open Garden was regarded as a single case since different Open Gardens had different characteristics. In this light, this research examined commonalities and differences amongst multiple cases. In terms of generalisation, although case studies conventionally have not been expected to be generalised, a minor level of generalisation can be achieved by this research. The present research will perhaps not be able to build a theory that explains the entire social phenomena, but its findings will be directly useful within Open Garden contexts. Knowledge discovered by this research can also be transferable to other garden-related contexts or other charity fundraising events more generally. Leisure and tourism pursuits in which power matters as an undercurrent and in which the displaying or signalling status are central issues are also subject areas to which findings of this research will contribute. Readers may be better in seeking connections between this thesis and their own interests. It is therefore misleading to conclude that there is no room for this multicase study research to be generalisable before readers make judgements. I have accounted for the rationale behind the selection of multicase study. The next section will offer an overview of the way in which I investigated multiple cases, that is, Open Gardens.

4.4. Timeframe of fieldwork

Even though I have applied different kinds of research methods for data generation, they can all be collectively labelled ‘fieldwork’. Detailed procedures for conducting the fieldwork, which include sampling, data collection and data analysis, will be explained in 4.5, 4.6 and 4.7 respectively. This section only provides an outline of the ways in which I carried out the fieldwork, which was divided into two phases, as illustrated in Table 1. An initial stage of fieldwork is to freely explore tangential

themes that, in later stages, may or may not develop into more central avenues of the research (Konopinski, 2014). The first phase of my fieldwork was therefore designed to gain a rough idea of what was going on in Open Gardens and to think what was worthy of further investigation. The second phase was to more rigorously investigate topics identified in the first phase. The entire process of fieldwork was a combination of different procedures for sampling research informants or location, collecting data and analysing them. Billo and Hiemstra (2010) emphasise the importance of flexibility in fieldwork because fieldwork by its nature can be a dynamic process in which its objective and orientation vary stage by stage. The outcome of data analysis undertaken in the first phase determined what to investigate at a deeper level in the second phase. Therefore, the data collection and analysis conducted in the second phase had a different and more deliberate focus or objectives from those of the first.

Table 1
Timeframe of fieldwork

First phase	Feb 2014	Fieldwork started (mainly participant observation)
		Domain analysis started
	Jun 2014	31 participant observations and 3 semi-structured interviews had been conducted
		Selection of themes for in-depth investigation
Second phase	Jul 2014	Semi-structured interviews became prioritised
		Code creation started
	Oct 2014	Another 8 observations and 38 semi-structured interviews had been conducted
		Code creation continued

The first phase of fieldwork started in February 2014. As will be explained in detail in 4.5, sampling was initiated in a broad context. Data was intentionally gathered from as broad a range of areas as possible in order to build some baseline understanding of Open Gardens. In the first phase, data were collected mostly from participant observation because this enabled me to interact with not only garden openers, but also their associates. Participant observations also provided a rough idea of how Open Gardens are run by garden openers and their associates. More detailed accounts of the ways in which qualitative data were gathered will be offered in 4.6. Analysis of qualitative data gathered from the fieldwork began halfway through the first phase so that gardens to visit and people to approach could be selected according to emerging themes. I conducted, as a specific method of data analysis,

domain analysis. Domain analysis assisted the categorisation of emerging themes. I shall re-visit domain analysis in 4.7 and explain it in detail.

By June 2014, 31 participant observations and three semi-structured interviews had been conducted. Based upon the result of the domain analysis, topics to investigate deeply in the second phase were selected. For instance, the realisation was dawning that there were different kinds of helpers who manage entrance administration, plant sales or catering, and there were different kinds of relationships between them and garden openers accordingly. Whereas most of the helpers that I met were friends of openers', some helpers, such as housekeepers or gardeners, were employed by garden openers. I wondered about the degree to which employed helpers were pleased to participate in Open Gardens as this could be regarded as extra duties. In this light, I decided to investigate more deeply the helpers' perceptions of their roles in the Open Gardens in the second phase.

In the second phase, use of semi-structured interviews was deemed most suitable for in-depth investigation of themes that emerged in the first phase, and hence became prioritised. This is because the observations were limited in the depth of understanding they permitted. Whilst the observations were suitable for gaining a general idea of what was going on in Open Gardens, spontaneous conversations with people that I encountered during fieldwork tended not to last long enough to deepen the understanding of their perceptions. Therefore, the themes roughly identified in the first phase began to be examined at a deeper level through semi-structured interviews. The transition from the first to second phase will be explained in detail in 4.6.

Despite the fact that the domain analysis employed during the first phase was a useful grouping tool, it was not tailored to precisely understand each of the categorised themes. It was therefore difficult to fully grasp what they actually were and how they were different from others. For example, socialising was identified as one of the motivations for opening a private garden to the public. Nevertheless, it was unclear with whom the garden openers who answered this way intended to

socialise. Even though socialising, which was also reported by previous studies on garden opening, connotes an opportunity to make acquaintances with strangers, some garden openers might just want to converse with their friends. If this is the case, the theme ‘socialising’ perhaps needs to be labelled and defined differently. To tackle this kind of vagueness, the necessity of code creation arose. I defined codes carefully so that they could take on more rigorously arrived-at forms. The created codes were continually reviewed and redeveloped up until the stage of writing up this thesis. A more in-depth explanation of code creation will be provided in 4.7.

By October 2014, another eight observations and 38 semi-structured interviews had been conducted. The whole data set was generated from 39 participant observations and 41 semi-structured interviews. I visited 42 gardens in total. This figure was smaller than the sum of observations and interviews because, as noted elsewhere, I necessarily visited some gardens two or three times for both observations and interviews. Sometimes I conducted interviews at the same garden, at different times, due to my respondents’ different availability. I stopped sampling when I reached this sample size because it was large enough to compare subjective views of garden openers, their helpers, volunteers and the staff of SG. The rationale behind this decision will be explained more carefully in the next section on sampling.

As the brief overview given above shows, the entire process of fieldwork was divided into two phases, and each phase used different procedures for sampling research respondents or location, collecting data and analysing them. In subsequent sections, I will explain in more detail the ways in which sampling, data collection and data analysis were undertaken.

4.5. Sampling

The sampling procedure of this research was purposive sampling. Purposive sampling is a sampling method which aims “to select information rich cases that best provide insight into the research questions and will convince the audience of the research” (Emmel, 2013: 33). Purposive sampling is the largest category of non-probability sampling methods, and hence includes many sub-categories (Teddlie and Yu, 2007). Amongst the 16 purposive sampling techniques suggested by Patton

(2002), I utilised maximum variation sampling, convenience sampling, opportunistic sampling and snowball sampling. Their definitions and an explanation of how I used these techniques in practice will be provided in the subsequent sections, as it makes more sense if they are discussed in appropriate contexts.

What is noteworthy in this introduction to my sampling procedures is the difference between purposive sampling and theoretical sampling which is another commonly applied sampling procedure of qualitative research. As Silverman (2011) problematises, purposive sampling and theoretical sampling tend to be seen as synonymous. The prominent advocate of theoretical sampling may be grounded theorists whose sampling procedure is commonly underpinned by the concept of theoretical saturation (Emmel, 2013). Theoretical saturation or data saturation refers to a point where nothing new is found and where redundancy is used as a principal criterion for sampling procedure (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). Scepticism of this conceptual or imaginary point is precisely why I avoided theoretical sampling. Even if one limits a realm of study, it is not entirely possible to comprehend everything about it. Moreover, whilst the indicator of theoretical saturation is data replication or redundancy (Bowen, 2008), it is uncertain how many times a theme needs to re-emerge to be identified as a replication. What if two respondents refer to the same thing? If two or three times are not enough to claim that the data set is complete, how about three or four times? The meaning of theoretical saturation and data replication therefore remains uncertain. Due to these doubts, this research did not apply theoretical sampling, but flexibly utilised several techniques of purposive sampling instead.

Sample size is a frequently debated issue in qualitative research because it can determine the quality of qualitative research, such as generalisability (Francis, Johnston, Robertson, Glidewell, Entwistle, Eccles and Grimshaw, 2010). When the aim of a qualitative inquiry is to make comparisons between multiple cases or respondents, they have to be systematically selected (Hantrais, 2009). As an alternative to the concept of data saturation, I considered, at the suggestion made by Brannen and Nilsen (2011), the comparability of the cases I had studied. As noted in

the Introduction, I have investigated perspectives of not only garden openers, but also of their helpers, volunteers and the salaried staff of SG. I stopped sampling in October 2014 because by this point different realities regarding the same topic had emerged. In terms of the display of horticultural achievement, for example, there were both positive and negative reactions towards show-offs. Furthermore, a minority of respondents had been sceptical about, or even unaware of, the existence of show-offs. Sample size of qualitative research should be determined by the degree to which the subjectivity of respondents reflects the topic being researched (Passerini, 2012). I therefore stopped sampling at that point because my sample size had achieved a sufficient diversity to make comparisons between respondents' subjectivity.

Of course, there was also a realistic rationale. As Flick (2007) and Galvin (2015) note, sample size of qualitative research is necessarily defined by outside or external determinants such as a limited timespan given for a research project. I admit that it was deemed necessary for me to stop sampling in October 2014 because my second year progression review was scheduled for the next month, and I needed to present some initial findings in the oral examination. In order to guarantee a certain period of time that I could spend on analysis and writing up, it was not realistic to continue sampling beyond that point. There was therefore also a pragmatic reasoning behind the termination of sampling.

The subsequent subsections are practical explanations of my sampling procedures. This research by nature had two kinds of objects to sample: gardens and humans. Whilst the main aim of fieldwork was to interact with respondents, it was difficult to approach them unless I visited gardens. Especially, at a very early stage of fieldwork when I did not personally know anyone involved in the co-production of Open Gardens, there was no option but to visit gardens on public open days as other general public did. For this reason, it was necessary and equally important to consider which gardens to visit – in other words, where to conduct fieldwork.

4.5.1. Fieldwork location

Gardens to visit for fieldwork were selected by means of maximum variation

sampling. Maximum variation sampling “aims at capturing and describing the central themes that cut across a great deal of variation” (Patton, 2002: 234-235). Considering the fact that more than 4000 Open Gardens were widely spread across the UK, the attempt of the first phase was to gather the data from as wide a range of locations as possible. If one aims to maximise a geographical variety of Open Gardens, the entire British Isles probably need to be covered. However, my budget for travel and the time that I could spend on fieldwork were both limited. In this light, I must admit that I also used convenience sampling, which is another technique for purposive sampling, and did what was easy in order to save time and money in the first instance (Patton, 2002). Some gardens open to the public are located far from the nearest train stations. Since I did not own a car, such gardens were not easily accessible. To minimise the bias of accessibility, the gardens located far from train stations were also visited by bike or on foot. The five months of first phase investigation covered Cumbria, the North East, Stafford and York in England, and Aberdeen, East Lothian, Fife, Midlothian and Stirling in Scotland. The reason for sampling Open Gardens in England was that the first phase was designed to familiarise myself with Open Gardens, and also to see whether there were any differences between Open Gardens run by SG and those run by the NGS.

As a result of the initial investigation conducted in the aforementioned locations, I decided to focus upon Scotland. This was not least because, as mentioned earlier, there has been no study that has focused on Scottish Open Gardens. There was certainly a gap in knowledge to fill. In addition, SG allows garden openers to nominate charities as well as the registered beneficiaries, and this option of raising money for charities was highlighted by some of the respondents whom I encountered during the first phase. Furthermore, the number of Scottish Open Gardens is ten times smaller than its counterpart, the NGS. This fact was believed by some of the people with whom I conversed during the first phase to be an influential factor that determined the strictness of garden selection in Scotland. I reasoned at that time that these might emerge, at later stages of fieldwork, as distinctive features of Scottish Open Gardens. For these reasons, the fieldwork location was narrowed down to Scotland.

Nevertheless, it was still unrealistic for me to cover all regions in Scotland because of limited budget and time. It was therefore deemed reasonable to further narrow down the fieldwork location to the Lowlands of Scotland. Even after the initiation of concentrating on the Lowlands, sampling still progressed on the basis of geographical convenience. Convenience sampling is most commonly used as a non-probability sampling technique, yet it is often regarded as an undesirable rationale behind the selection of specific cases. This is because cases sampled in this way may be less likely to yield rich information, compared to more strategic sampling techniques (Farrokhi and Mahmoudi-Hamidabad, 2012; Patton, 2002). However, this geographical limitation was utilised by conducting opportunistic sampling. Opportunistic sampling is another purposive sampling technique that flexibly capitalises on unexpected opportunities that emerge in the course of data collection (Omona, 2013). Flexibility and on-the-spot decision making are in some occasions deemed crucial to gain access to hard-to-reach people (Patton, 2002). In this research, it was likely that garden openers introduced his or her helpers who live nearby. Helpers are not easily accessible because their contact details are not available in the guidebook or website, unlike garden openers and volunteers. Some of the helpers introduced by openers in that way only agreed to see me on the same day, and I mostly managed to take advantage of such unforeseen opportunities. This is because even if I missed the train I had originally booked, it was still possible to come back to Edinburgh on the same day by other train services or by bus. If the research location had included the Scottish Highlands, which are far from Edinburgh, it would have been more difficult to take advantage of those spontaneous opportunities. In short, limiting the geographical locations of the gardens to visit facilitated the access to research respondents.

In summary, the fieldwork location was chosen by means of maximum variation sampling, convenience sampling and opportunistic sampling. I have to admit the selection of fieldwork locations had partially run on the principle of geographical convenience. However, geographically limiting the fieldwork location meant that easier access to, and more flexible interaction with, respondents were gained.

Purposive sampling techniques are not mutually exclusive, but are often combined in practice. As implied above, opportunistic sampling is closely associated with snowballing sampling in which a respondent proposes another respondent who is knowledgeable about a topic of research (Bryman, 2016). More detailed and practical accounts of the ways in which I approached garden openers and their associates will be given in the next subsection.

4.5.2. Gaining access to respondents

There were two principal ways in which I gained access to garden openers and other parties concerned (Table 2). One was to visit gardens on predetermined open days. Another was to visit gardens by appointment. When visiting gardens on public opening days, there was not so much necessity to recruit respondents as anyone can enter gardens open to the public in this manner by paying the entrance fees, and can talk to garden openers. I visited such Open Gardens as other visitors did, and talked to garden openers and other kinds of people assisting them. Due to the fact that several kinds of parties involved in the co-production of Open Gardens were present in the gardens on public open days, visiting gardens on public open days enabled me to interact not only with garden openers, but also with their associates. I talked to different people that I encountered in gardens, and asked them ‘Grand Tour’ questions. These are a type of question that ethnographers ask at an early stage of fieldwork in order to elicit information on what is going on in the studied phenomena

	Opening on predetermined days	Opening by appointment
Types of data	Multiple interaction	Single interaction
Strength	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Easy access 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Certainty of recognising garden openers • High probability of having conversation with garden openers
Weakness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uncertainty of meeting or recognising garden openers • Low probability of having conversations with garden openers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relatively difficult access

and also to provide a rough sketch of participants' views (Fetterman, 2010). For example, I asked garden openers 'What made you open this garden to the public?' or 'Who do you work with?', because such generic questions could be posed to any kinds of garden openers and I could infer from their remarks what should be focused in later stages of fieldwork. Thus, visiting gardens on the predetermined open days was appropriate for the primary objective of the first phase of fieldwork, that is to say, familiarising myself with Open Gardens and gaining an idea of what was going on in Open Gardens.

However, garden visits on public open days were not ideal to examine such themes at a deeper level. This was because of the ever-changing nature of casual conversations conducted in the field (Robson, 2011). Open Gardens were realised as a social occasion in which interactions with people change from person to person. As DeWalt and DeWalt (2011) point out, first encounters with people in the field may not always be successful. In my case, it was often difficult to continue spontaneous conversations for a certain length of time. Therefore, garden visits by appointment became prioritised at the second phase of fieldwork. This enabled me to converse with the respondents face to face without any distraction, and hence was often intertwined with recorded interviews. Garden visits by appointment mostly brought only a single interaction between the researcher and a garden opener although there were situations where other kinds of parties concerned, such as an opener's friend who sold refreshments on the predetermined open days, were occasionally present. When visiting gardens by appointment, there was no difficulty in recognising openers, which was sometimes not straightforward where there were numerous visitors in the gardens on the predetermined open days. Moreover, garden visits by appointment were a way to deal with the limited research budget. The garden openers I approached in this way never asked me to pay the entrance fee, although they could have done so. Some of them kindly picked me up or dropped me off at train stations so that there was less pressure on the travel budget drawn up for fieldwork.

Nevertheless, visiting gardens on predetermined public opening days still played an important role even in the second phase of fieldwork in light of recruiting

respondents for further in-depth investigation. In other words, public openings were an ideal opportunity to make acquaintance with garden openers and their associates such as helpers or volunteer organisers. I verbally explained my research to them and gave them a research information sheet on which my name, affiliation and contact details were written (Appendix 6). This made it easier for me to arrange a meeting for a further in-depth interview. Appointments to visit the gardens in person and to interview the openers were made by means of email, telephone or letter (Appendix 8). Recruitment of helpers and volunteer workers were undertaken by means of the snowballing technique. This is a purposive sampling technique “in which the researcher initially samples a small group of people relevant to the research questions, and these sampled participants propose other participants who have had the experience or characteristics relevant to the research” (Bryman, 2016: 415). I mostly asked the openers, who are the hub of interpersonal relationships shaped by Open Gardens, to introduce me to other parties concerned. Snowballing technique is particularly useful when access to specific types of respondents is limited (Flick, 2009). As noted earlier, the use of this technique was particularly helpful when approaching helpers whose contact details were not available in the guidebook or website.

The aim of the snowballing technique is to ask people to introduce other people who know what cases are information rich (Patton, 2002). Requesting garden openers to introduce helpers was most efficient, but they were not necessarily holders of useful information. It was therefore necessary to approach other kinds of parties concerned. In particular, conversations with openers, helpers and volunteers did not inform me of the operation of SG’s head office in Edinburgh. Despite the necessity to interview the staff of SG, they were rarely present in gardens on their public open days. I requested a volunteer organiser, who was also a trustee of SG and met the staff of the organisation at regular meetings, to introduce me to the Chief Executive of SG. After interviewing the Chief Executive, I asked him to introduce me to his subordinates. As Emmel (2013) notes, snowballing sampling sometimes leads to themes that are of importance to studied phenomena. This strategy is particularly meaningful when social networks are a key interest of research (Browne, 2005). Snowballing sampling

shed light on interpersonal relationships between people involved in the production of Open Gardens. Especially, it indicated who is intimate with whom because respondents introduced me to those who were, for them, easy to introduce. The snowballing technique therefore helped me to understand the interpersonal relationships between my respondents.

As explained above, access to research respondents was gained in two different ways. One was by making a garden visit on public open days, and another was garden visiting by appointment. Even though visiting gardens on their public open days was a useful way to acquaint myself with what was going on in Open Gardens, this way was not adequate to deepen my understanding of emerging themes. It also became apparent that spontaneous conversations with people I met on public open days did not last long. For these reasons, it became necessary to visit gardens by appointment and to talk to more respondents at length in person. Respondents who knew which cases were information rich were not only garden openers, but also helpers, volunteers and the staff of SG. I managed to approach them by means of the snowballing technique. This technique was useful to form a general overview of interpersonal relationships between parties involved in the production of Open Gardens.

To summarise this entire section on sampling, different sampling procedures were applied where appropriate. Ultimately, what I had intended when selecting gardens to visit and people to approach was to gather a range of data so that the weakness of each procedure would be prevented from overlapping and the research could gain complementary strength (Brewer and Hunter, 1989). I have accounted for my sampling procedures, and now will start explaining how qualitative data were collected from the sampled informants.

4.6. Data collection

In accord with the paradigmatic underpinnings of this research, practical methods of data collection fall under the broad umbrella of the qualitative approach to research. This is because the previous studies on contemporary garden openings were largely

based upon quantitative approaches, and the present research aims to discover what those could not. To give a brief overview of methods used by previous studies, Connell (2005), Ryan and Bates (1995) and Tipples and Gibbons (1992) employed questionnaire surveys and distributed them to garden owners who opened their gardens to the public and visitors to the gardens. Surveys would not be ideal for exploring the meaning of behaviour or events under investigation because items on questionnaires often read differently to respondents, and hence are likely to be misunderstood by them (Belson, 1981). In addition, there is often some discrepancy between what is stated by respondents and their actual behaviour (LaPiere, 2010). For these reasons, survey design was thought to be inadequate.

Lipovská (2013) used interviews, but they were structured interviews which are closely associated with the ethos of quantitative methods. Survey and structured interview are both characterised by the standardisation of questioning (Brinkmann, 2012). Just like questionnaire surveys, structured interviews have predetermined items and follow fixed interview guides. Because of their inflexibility, there is a possibility that structured interviews fail to identify important themes emerging in the course of data collection. Instead of completely determining research orientations in advance, the research needed to be flexibly directed according to the emerging themes. For this reason, the importance of an inductive and qualitative approach came to the fore. Being the most comprehensive study to date in this area it is also important to note that one of Connell's (2002) recommendations was for qualitative studies to be undertaken. In keeping with Connell's recommendation, this research employed data collection that included documentary analysis, participant observation and semi-structured interviews. In the subsequent sections, I will rationalise this choice and explain how I conducted them in practice.

4.6.1. Documentary analysis

Documentary analysis is "a form of qualitative analysis that requires researchers to locate, interpret, analyse and draw conclusions about the evidence presented" (Fitzgerald, 2012: 298). Whilst the primary research method of this research is fieldwork conducted in present Open Gardens, documentary analysis was first carried out as a supplementary and preliminary data collection. The purpose of the

documentary analysis that I conducted was to gain accurate information on the history of the NGS and SG. I needed to understand the degree to which the present was informed by the past, as historical events in the development of the NGS and SG cannot be directly observed. This can be illuminated by considering Scott's (1990) distinction between 'proximate access' and 'mediate access' by the observer. Proximate or direct access by the observer refers to the case in which the observer and the observed are contemporaneous, co-present and coincident. This "spatio-temporal location" (Scott, 1990: 2) shared by the observer and the observed enables the former to use visual, audio, tactile and other kinds of sensory abilities to witness the current behaviour of the latter. This is typically the way in which fieldwork is carried out. Mediate or indirect access by an observer means that the observer infers past events and someone's behaviour from their material traces such as readable or audible sources.

To indirectly observe and describe what was going on in the past as accurately as possible, it is crucial to seek evidence, and scouring evidence is, as Prior (2016) notes, the dominant purpose of conducting documentary analysis in the social science. There has already been research that focuses on documents explaining the history of the NGS and SG. Indeed, in the literature review I have already cited Aida's (2002) PhD thesis on the historical development of Open Gardens under the auspices of the NGS. However, I was a little bit sceptical about the accuracy and limitations of his historical accounts. For example, he wrote in Japanese that the list of people who opened their garden for the NGS in June 1927 (for the first time in its history) was like Debrett's Peerage (Aida, 2002: 49), but did not specify which minute of the QNI, which was used as the primary data source in his thesis, he consulted and found such a description. Edmonstone (2006) and Isobel (1981) also inform us of the historical development of SG, albeit briefly. Similarly, I was not entirely sure about the accuracy of their works because they are not peer-reviewed research papers, but articles that appeared in the guidebooks of SG. It was even unclear what documents Edmonstone (2006) and Isobel (1981) consulted to compile their historical accounts of Open Gardens, as their works include no reference to data sources. Therefore, the ultimate aim of documentary analysis that I conducted was to

check whether the works of Aida (2002), Edmonstone (2006) and Isobel (1981) are accurate, factual and evidence-based.

In pursuance of this aim, I consulted four kinds of historic sources: the minutes of QNI (1926-1976), annual reports of QNI (1977-1997), Report for Queen's Institute Council Meeting (1953) and guidebooks of SG (1951, 1953, 1955, 1962-1991 and 1994-2010). As explained in the literature review, the NGS was originally a committee in QNI. Its minutes are archived in the Wellcome Library, London, and are available from 1926 to 1976. The committee became independent from QNI and became the NGS in 1980. In order to collect information on its post-independence development, it was necessary to access the annual reports of QNI. These reports are also archived in the Wellcome Library, and were not reviewed by Aida (2002). Whereas the minutes and annual reports of QNI intermittently mention information on SG, I consulted its previous guidebooks to gain more detailed information. The guidebooks were available partly in the National Library Scotland and partly in the head office of SG, both of which are in Edinburgh. Documents provide insights into the background of past events (Bowen, 2008). Therefore, information about the dates of specific milestones in the historical development of NGS and SG were considered to be data. It was adequate to treat such information as data because the primal objective of the documentary analysis that I employed was to gain a more precise understanding of the officially recorded historical development of Open Gardens.

Documentary analysis can be undertaken in different ways, and Atkinson and Coffey (2011) offer useful guidelines. The first point to consider is language and the form of documents used as data sources. For example, minutes are usually structured in distinctive ways, and are comprised of specific terminology. Each minute of QNI usually starts with descriptions about when and where the meeting was held, who was present and absent and what the agendas were, and are then followed by topics discussed. Since I had not previously consulted any documents with this format, it was initially difficult for me to grasp the contents of minutes. Hence, I first needed to familiarise myself with them. Once I adapted to them and came to understand their nuanced meanings, however, it became much easier to collect data relevant to my

research. As noted in Introduction, the NGS was originally a part of QNI. Therefore, information on Open Gardens was accompanied with its own subheadings such as ‘Garden Sub-Committee’. Such subheadings assisted me with the identification of sections to which I should pay close attention.

Another point to consider, according to Atkinson and Coffey (2011), is the intertextuality of documents. They suggest that documents being reviewed often refer to other documents that can also be of significance to research. This suggestion makes sense because in documentary analysis sources are scoured for evidence, and this is precisely why contents in the text are of fundamental importance to research (Prior, 2016). Documents are not only witnesses that provide backgrounds on historical events, but also supplementary research data sources that suggest what should be farther researched (Bowen, 2009). In this research, QNI’s minutes often include information about guidebooks. Consulting the guidebooks was a useful way to grasp how agendas for meetings were materialised. Consulting multiple documents is an important strategy to enhance the scientific standard of qualitative research. This is something to which I shall return in a later section on data verification and trustworthiness.

The rationale behind my documentary analysis was to examine the accuracy of existing works on the history of the NGS and SG. As demonstrated above, I operated my documentary analysis in accordance with the two points Atkinson and Coffey (2011) suggest: language and form, and intertextuality of documents consulted. As a result, I found that works of Aida (2002), Edmonstone (2006) and Isobel (1981) correspond with the aforementioned historical sources. Therefore, I decided to cite their works, as well as the historical sources themselves, to elaborate the historical development of NGS and SG. However, as I pointed out in the literature review, there was a piece of false information in the webpage of SG. The webpage informs that the 40/60 split in money raised for charities was initiated in 1961, but a Report for the Queen’s Institute Council Meeting (SGS, 1953b) informs us that it was in fact 1951. It was meaningful to conduct the documentary analysis otherwise this thesis would have been structured without adequate foundation.

Finally, it is important to remember that the documentary analysis was not my primary method of data collection. Documents have their own realities, which should not be considered to be typical representation of the reality that underlies an organisation that is subject to investigation (Bryman, 2012). Atkinson and Coffey state (2011) that because of this ‘documentary reality’, “Documentary sources are not surrogates for other kinds of data. We cannot, for instance, learn through written records alone how an organisation actually operates day by day” (79). It is therefore prudent to consider the extent to which data collected from past documents can provide insights into present Open Gardens. In the sense that it is important to triangulate data sources, it was equally (or more) important to step into the field and to witness what was going on in current Open Gardens. I will explain the ways in which I carried out other data collections in the subsequent sections.

4.6.2. Participant observation

Participant observation is a frequently-used research method that encapsulates “the relatively prolonged immersion of the observer in a social setting in which he or she seeks to observe the behaviour of members of that setting (group, organization, community, etc.) and to elicit the meanings they attribute to their environment and behaviour” (Bryman, 2012: 273). In order to enhance the general understanding of Open Gardens, participant observations were conducted in the first phase in 32 different gardens open to the public. It was intended that by observing as wide a range of Open Gardens as possible, themes to be investigated deeply in the second phase will be determined. The rationale behind the participant observation was to reveal what respondents would hesitate to talk about, and hence to maintain criticality by not accepting data at face value (Patton, 2002). Unlike semi-structured interviews in which research respondents interact with, and can be influenced by, the researcher, what is observed in the field is not under the researcher’s control (Stake, 1995). Participant observation was therefore appropriate to compensate for limitations of the semi-structured interviews.

Data gained from participant observation varied. Since fieldwork aims to capture the communicative and interactive details of studied settings, what people say or do with

words is traditionally recognised as qualitative data (Holstein and Gubrium, 2008). In addition, following Bengtsson's (2014) suggestion, facial expressions or sensory information such as smell or visual images are also treated as 'silent data' or non-verbal data in fieldwork. Both types of data were gathered during my fieldwork, and were archived through the process of written documentation. A detailed explanation of how I wrote up my fieldnotes is given below. Internal documents circulated inside an organisation were also occasionally collected and used as data in fieldwork, at Bogdan and Biklen's (2007) suggestion. I managed to derive Garden Results & District Totals 2009-2013 (SG, 2013), the Guidelines for District Organiser (SG, 2012a) and the Garden Owners' Information Pack (SG, 2011), from my respondents. To be precise, these were different from sources consulted in my documentary analysis. I also drew, based upon the suggestion made by Clerke and Hopwood (2014), information from flyers or brochure of local Open Gardens because they were only available in local places such as cafes or Open Gardens, and were not sold in bookstores. Of course, the guidebook of SG was an important source of information.

In terms of the degree of participation, I did not become a "complete participant" (Spradley 1980: 61). This term refers to "an ethnographer who integrates into and purposely interacts with the sample's world" (Barton, 2008: 10). Arguments in favour of this suggest that an inquirer cannot comprehend background, behaviour or practice, unless he or she becomes a complete insider that provides a high degree of involvement in the culture, or sub-culture under investigation. When those who co-produce Open Gardens are distinguished from visitors who consume Open Gardens, the complete participant would mean becoming a garden opener, helper, volunteer organiser or worker for SG. Becoming one of these kinds of parties was beyond the scope of this research. It was unrealistic for me to become a garden opener because I did not own a garden. It was also difficult for me to become a helper or a volunteer as one of the local committee members because they are usually appointed through word of mouth recommendation. I was also different from a complete onlooker. I only 'passively participated' and occasionally conversed with those being observed (DeWalt and DeWalt, 2011). As a limitation of this degree of participation, I am not

able to offer an emotional or intimate account of the co-production of Open Gardens because I have not managed an Open Garden.

Nevertheless, the outsider's viewpoints do not necessarily impact negatively on research findings. Pike (1954), who is known to have first distinguished between the *emic* (insider) perspective and the *etic* (outsider) perspective, indicates that the latter is of significance for those who compare a culture studied with other cultures. The value of my cultural background as Japanese might lie in my unfamiliarity with British garden culture. Spradley (1980) states that "The *less* familiar you are with a social situation, the *more* you are able to see the tacit cultural rules at work" (62). Simmel's (1921) classic account of *The Sociological Significance of 'Stranger'* explains that the outsider position potentially allows insiders to confide what they generally would not. Indeed, my status as an outsider occasionally enabled me to explore sensitive subjects and to ask naïve questions. For example, one of the District Organisers, who voluntarily worked for SG, told me about his real intention behind the engagement in Open Gardens on condition that I would not disclose it to other inside parties involved in the production of Scottish Open Gardens; this is something to which I will return. Inspired by Simmel's aforementioned work, Hodgetts, Stolete, Radley, Leggatt-Cook, Groot and Chamberlain (2011) claim that *de facto* entry into another cultural scene cannot be attained unless the researcher is an outsider. The low degree of participation was thus seen as both beneficial and essential to the investigation of Open Gardens.

There was a practical dilemma over whether I should tell my respondents my role and identity as a researcher in the field. There was no intention to conduct covert observations, as this is rarely justifiable (Bulmer, 1982). From an ethical point of view, it was safer to inform people in the field about this research study, at least when they asked about my intentions. This is consistent with my decision not to be a complete participant. There is a risk that a complete participant is not recognised as a researcher by people under observation, and consequently there is no actual difference between the complete participant and a covert observer (Gold, 1958). However, my concern was that people might become unwilling to converse with me

once I had introduced myself. Therefore, during the initial stages of fieldwork, I tentatively used both approaches. As I had anticipated beforehand, a few people that I spoke to took an instant and apparent dislike to me when I announced myself. I also found that without telling them who I was and what I was doing, it was difficult to continue a conversation with people in Open Gardens. Since it was important to build trust and friendly relationships with people in the field for further in-depth investigation, about halfway through the series of fieldwork sessions, I began to introduce myself as a PhD student researching Open Gardens.

As Emerson, Fretz and Shaw (2011) discuss, another common subject matter for fieldworkers is when, where and how to write fieldnotes. The process of writing fieldnotes was divided into two stages. One was brief note-taking during fieldwork, and another was writing up full fieldnotes at my office after each session of fieldwork. Following a suggestion made by Emmerson et al. (2011), in the garden I jotted down first impressions and sensory accounts of gardens, people I encountered there and their behaviours. For example, I articulate my first impression of a farm garden that I visited during the first phase as follows.

13:15 (approx.) - Arrived at the place. Immediately after I got out of the taxi, I realised it was smelly. I had forgotten it is a farm.

Such sensory accounts of first impressions were not directly relevant to the objective of this research, but functioned as clues to other antecedent or subsequent events such as who I met, what kind of person he or she was and what I talked about with the person. Note-taking during fieldwork also involves, or can be identical to, sketching the scenes observed (Gunn, 2009). What I often drew was bird's-eye views of spaces in which I was present, such as herbaceous borders, conservatories where refreshments were served or entrances of gardens. This was because it was difficult to photograph them. Again, such spatial information was not directly relevant to the topic of this research, but was a useful reminder of what happened or what I observed. Black-and-white sketching is often a spontaneous practice done during fieldwork, and evokes memories of fieldwork when typing up fieldnotes with a computer (Clerke and Hopwood, 2014). Note-taking and sketching during fieldwork

therefore assisted me with remembering events in chronological order, which helped greatly when writing more detailed fieldnotes. An example of a jotted note and sketch is shown in Appendix 4.

Full fieldnotes were written up in my office on the same day of the visit while my memory of them was still fresh. Bond (1990) raises a question, ‘What are fieldnotes?’, and provides two defining characteristics of a fieldnote. One is descriptive texts that archive fieldwork. I wrote down what I observed or what happened in my presence, in front of me, during a fieldwork session. This included portraits of the subjects, description of physical settings, dialogues observed, the occurrence of particular events and my behaviours (Bogdan and Biklen, 2007). It is not precise to state that a fieldnote records ‘everything’ observed because observations usually have specific targets (Blommaert and Jie, 2011). Fieldnotes record observed realities, which inevitably includes the process of selection of what is written (Emerson et al., 2011). I had particular topics in my mind during fieldwork, hence my fieldnotes partly reflect my own interest and themes from a body of literature that I had read beforehand. This is exemplified by an extract from a fieldnote below.

On the way to [the garden visited], I saw neighbours’ houses and they were all big and had spacious gardens. However, I didn’t find the properties posh. The cars they own may illustrate this feeling.

This statement demonstrates the inspiration gained from Veblen’s (1889) thinking about the leisure class and my specific focus on the status display and the culture of affluent people. An element of selectivity existed not only in written documentation, but also in visual records of what I observed. I deliberately often combined photographs that I took in gardens with written descriptions. I photographed, for instance, owners conversing with visitors, or helpers serving teas and cakes, because I intended to understand who played what roles in Open Gardens. Photographs serve not only as an *aide-memoire* that helps us recollect what the fieldworker has seen, but also as tools that facilitate analysis conducted after fieldwork (Crabtree, Rouncefield and Tolmie, 2012). My fieldnotes were therefore archives of human

behaviours and events to which I paid attention, and were indicators of analytical orientations.

Another defining characteristic of a fieldnote is its “personal, parochial, subjective, indefinable quality” (Bond, 1990: 274). Fieldnotes are personal diaries that archive the fieldworker’s emotions such as confusion, boredom, anger, anxiety or excitement (Blommaert and Jie, 2011). My state of mind varied considerably during the course of the fieldwork, and I wrote down different feelings that I had on specific occasions. For instance, one of my fieldnotes articulates the confusion that I experienced when talking about the motivation for opening gardens to the public with a garden opener and her friends.

She [the opener’s friend] was talking about her visit to Kyoto and her professional interest in Japanese (horti)culture such as temple gardens. Even though she spoke about Japan, that didn’t come into my mind because I started to thinking about the meaning of what [the garden opener] said earlier, “We don’t want to be selfish!”

This narrative reminds me that I was lost in the middle of a conversation. Occasionally, I recorded annoyance too. There was a garden opener who had forgotten my appointment to interview her. Therefore, she was not ready when I arrived at her garden, but unwillingly took me on a tour of the garden. The fieldnote of this visit records my irritation as follows.

There were two or three containers of bonsai. She repeatedly called them ‘bonzai’ though. I didn’t correct her. Instead I mentioned ‘It reminds me of Japan!’ to express appreciation for her ‘bonzai’ but she didn’t say anything about it and just kept explaining. There was certainly not enough interaction between us while she was explaining.

This dialogue is for me a reminder of the moment that the conversation with this garden opener did not flow smoothly. Dialogues are reconstructed by the researcher when writing up fieldnotes, and hence are reflexive accounts of conversations that the researcher had with people present in the field (Bogdan and Biklen, 2007). My fieldnotes were reflections of my perspective, which may be different from my respondents’ views. As the examples provided show, my fieldnotes have functioned

as reminders of how I felt during fieldwork, as well as serving as factual information about the occurrence of events.

In most of the garden visits on public open days, I managed to converse with garden openers, helpers and volunteers. Whilst informal conversations that I had with garden openers and other kinds of people who were present in gardens enabled me to establish a baseline understanding of Open Gardens, they were not adequate to deeply investigate topics in which I was interested and themes that emerged during the participant observations. This was because such arbitrary interactions did not last long, and passed without covering the questions I had carefully prepared, in situations where people frequently change position and move from person to person, or group to group to talk. Because of the superficiality of data drawn from participant observations, it became crucial to interview them without any interruption. Consequently, I developed an interview schedule to provide more depth to emerging findings.

4.6.3. Semi-structured interviews

Semi structured interviews are “planned, yet flexible, interviews with the purpose of obtaining descriptions of specific experiences of the interviewees, and which normally aim for some interpretation of the meaning of the described phenomena” (Brinkmann, 2012: 85). Outlining a range of interview strategies, Silverman (2011) differentiates the semi-structured interview from the structured interview that seeks neutrality and also from the open-ended interview that seeks flexibility. The semi-structured interview therefore avoids over-reliance upon neutrality and flexibility. Semi-structured interviews that I conducted in this research were deliberately differentiated from informal conversations in participant observations. Unlike informal conversations during participant observations, most of the semi-structured interviews were audio-recorded where interviewees permitted, which enabled me to capture verbal data more precisely. The semi-structured interviews were a part of my fieldwork, and hence interview transcripts were incorporated in fieldnotes that I wrote up after every single fieldwork. My fieldnotes were, as explained earlier, a written and sketched record of sensory information (Emerson et al., 2011). Therefore, both verbal and non-verbal data were gathered through semi-structured interviews

(Bengtsson, 2014).

Unlike participant observations, appointments were made beforehand so that the interviews were conducted with those who are involved in the co-production of Open Gardens face to face. Even though a variety of ways were used to approach the interviewees, the most successful way to recruit them was the snowballing technique (see 4.5). As noted earlier, I made acquaintance with the garden openers, who are the hub of communities shaped by Open Gardens, and then asked them to introduce me to different garden openers or their associates. A total of 41 interviews were conducted. Each interview was audio recorded except for one case where the interviewee politely refused to be recorded. I treated face-to-face interviews as the greatest priority but telephone interviews were also undertaken four times at the interviewees' request. Face-to-face interviews were perceived to be more fruitful because, as Walliman (2006) explains, they can provide visual clues such as eye-contact, smiling or puzzled looks. Telephone interviews were also opportunistic, as they were much more quickly conducted and did not require me to physically visit gardens. Interviews with garden openers were conducted in their houses/gardens or other locations suggested by them, such as cafes. The four telephone interviews were all with volunteer organisers. In terms of the number of interviewees in an interview, there were sometimes more than two; they were married couples or friends of people that I had approached. Details of interview dates, locations and the number of participants in each interview are shown in Table 3.

Date	Location (incl. telephone)	The number and type of interviewees
2 nd Mar 2014	House/garden in Edinburgh	2 openers of the same Open Garden
29 th Mar 2014	Garden in Edinburgh	1 opener
10 th May 2014	House/garden in East Lothian	1 opener
26 th May 2014	Café in Edinburgh	1 opener
14 th Jun 2014	House/garden in Aberdeenshire	1 opener
25 th Jun 2014	House/garden in Edinburgh	1 opener

5 th Jul 2014	House/garden in Midlothian	1 opener
6 th Jul 2014	House/garden in Fife	1 opener
7 th Jul 2014	House/garden in Fife	1 helper
8 th Jul 2014	House/garden in Glasgow	1 opener
11 th Jul 2014	Head office of SG	1 member of SG staff
12 th Jul 2014	Telephone	1 opener
15 th Jul 2014	Head office of SG	1 members of SG staff
15 th Jul 2014	Head office of SG	1 members of SG staff
15 th Jul 2014	Royal Scots Club in Edinburgh	1 prospective opener
16 th Jul 2014	House/garden in Fife	1 opener who was also a District Organiser of Fife and trustee of SG
16 th Jul 2014	House in Fife	1 Treasurer
16 th Jul 2014	Garden in Fife	1 helper
16 th Jul 2014	Garden in Fife	1 helper
16 th Jul 2014	House/garden in Fife	1 opener and 1 helper
20 th Jul 2014	Pub in Midlothian	1 helper
23 rd Jul 2014	House/garden in Fife	1 opener who was also a treasurer of Fife and trustee of SG
28 th Jul 2014	House/garden in Midlothian	1 opener
31 st Jul 2014	House/garden in West Lothian	1 opener
3 rd Aug 2014	Art Centre in Fife	1 helper
4 th Aug 2014	House/garden in Midlothian	1 opener
5 th Aug 2014	House/garden in Aberdeenshire	1 opener
7 th Aug 2014	House/garden in Glasgow	2 openers of different Open Gardens
9 th Aug 2014	House/garden in Fife	1 opener
18 th Aug 2014	Telephone	1 helper
19 th Aug 2014	Garden in Fife	1 helper
25 th Aug 2014	House/garden in Fife	2 openers of the same Open Garden
6 th Sep 2014	Telephone	1 opener who was also an Area Organiser of Ettrick & Lauderdale
9 th Sep 2014	House/garden in Stirlingshire	1 opener who was also an Area Organiser of Stirlingshire and 1 other Area Organiser of the same district
11 th Sep 2014	Telephone	1 opener who was also a District Organiser of Kirkcudbrightshire
12 th Sep 2014	Telephone	1 District Organiser of East Lothian
12 th Sep 2014	Telephone	1 District Organiser of Moray & Nairn
15 th Sep 2014	House/garden in Ettrick	1 opener who was also an Area Organiser of Ettrick & Lauderdale

23 rd Sep 2014	Café in Edinburgh	1 opener who was also a District Organiser of Dunfriesshire and trustee of SG
2 nd Oct 2014	House/garden in Dunbartonshire	3 openers of different Open Gardens
17 th Oct 2014	House/garden in East Lothian	1 opener

The primary objective of the semi-structured interview was to gain deeper understanding of themes identified through participant observations. I prepared interview guides to cover questions and topics to ask with the purpose of deepening the understanding of pre-identified themes. Whilst semi-structured interviews are planned interviews, they provide interviewees with room to talk about whatever they would think to be of importance to the research. Brinkmann explains this point by stating:

Semi-structured interviews can make more use of the knowledge-producing potentials of dialogues by making much more *leeway* for following up on whatever angles are deemed important by the interviewee, and the interviewer has a greater chance of becoming visible as a knowledge-producing participant in the process itself, rather than hiding behind a preset interview guide. [Emphasis added] (Brinkmann, 2012: 85)

Occasionally, the interviewee's response showed possible research avenues that were beyond my expectation. In such cases, the interview guides were flexibly changed and new questions which were not on the guide were instantly asked. One of the advantages of semi-structured interviews is their adaptability to ever-changing situations or other environmental factors. Robson explains this point as follows:

The interviewer has an interview guide that serves as a checklist of topics to be covered and a default wording and order for the questions, but the wording and order are often substantially modified based on the flow of the interview, and additional unplanned questions are asked to follow up on what the interviewee says. (Robson, 2011: 280)

There was always concern over the balance between inflexibility and flexibility. Whilst quality of interviewing depends in part on an interviewer's situational competence, it was also necessary to carefully design an interview guide in order to

ensure pursuing the same fundamental lines of inquiry with each interviewee (Patton, 2002). Without interview guides or protocols, interviews may result in irrelevance to the research objective and the absence of any difference between semi-structured interviews and unstructured interviews (Bernard, 2000). Over-rigidity, nevertheless, results in no difference from structured interviews. Basically, I aimed to create an atmosphere in which respondents felt easy to talk about whatever they wanted. However, as Silverman (2001) warns, open-endedness tends to generate irrelevant information. Fox et al. (2010) admit, as a reflection on their own ethnographic research into the motivation of garden visiting, that conversational interviews with visitors sometimes generated information irrelevant to the research. Similarly, my respondents occasionally talked about things unrelated to this research, especially when there were more than two respondents participating in an interview. Since it was common in Open Gardens for helpers or volunteers to be the opener's friends, the natural dynamics of friendship sometimes turned group interviews into frivolous chats.

Since misdirection in interviews is a problem that must be minimised, it is a responsibility and strategy of interviewers to re-direct and guide the interviewees back on course (Holstein and Gubrium, 2011, 2003). Practically, I actively engaged in interviewees' meaning construction, by phrasing, for example, 'So what's your answer to my original question?'. Occasionally, I told the interviewees other people's opinions, saying 'Some people said... What do you think about this?' One might critically point out that knowledge gained in this way is not that of the interviewees, but of the interviewer. Arguably, the engagement of an interviewer in the interviews is not necessarily regarded as a source of bias (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007). My verbal assistance played a role of facilitator that orientates the interviewees towards the intended direction and enabled them to construct their subjective meanings in collaboration with myself. As noted earlier in the section on research paradigm, the mutual influence between the inquirer and the inquired into has been taken for granted in qualitative research. Williams' (1984) idea of 'co-authored construction' of the interview or Rapport's (2013) 'talking partnership' indicates that researchers are an important actor in the interviews. It was necessary for me to participate in the

interviews to generate sufficient and usable data.

This section on data collection started with the documentary analysis carried out to gain detailed information on the histories of the NGS and SG. The documentary analysis examined the accuracy of existing works on the subject, but also suggested that the historical sources that I consulted were insufficient to inform present aspects of Open Gardens. Data collection for fieldwork proceeded inductively. The participant observations, which were conducted mostly in the first phase of fieldwork, enabled me to gain ideas of what was going on in Scottish Open Gardens. The degree of my participation at this point had been minimal because it was not realistic for me to become a complete participant. This was not perceived as having a negative impact on the research, but rather assisted me with exploring sensitive topics that would not be disclosed without an intimate relationship between respondents and myself. I announced who I was and what I was doing partly because it minimised a risk of ethical issues, and partly because it facilitated conversations with those I encountered there. Under the circumstance where many spontaneous chats occurred one after another, it was sometimes difficult to keep conversing with garden openers or other parties concerned. In order to examine the themes identified in the participant observations at a deeper level, the use of the semi-structured interview gradually became prioritised. I always made a list of questions to ask so that each individual would be interviewed along the same lines. However, flexibility was also important to broaden the potential orientation of research. The appropriate balance between firmness and flexibility was continually sought.

Data collected from one case determined the orientation of the next session of data collection. In transition from one session of fieldwork to another, there was of course the in-between process of analysis, otherwise it would not be possible to reasonably decide from where or from whom the next data should be gathered. In the next section, I will offer detailed accounts of the ways in which I analysed qualitative data.

4.7. Qualitative data analysis

Qualitative data analysis is the process of identifying emerging themes, of defining and classifying them according to characteristics peculiar to each theme and of

interpreting them to make descriptive explanations of both explicit and implicit meanings of studied phenomena (Flick, 2014). It is different from the contextualisation of theories with research findings, as there are theoretical and methodological influences on data analysis (Roulston, 2014). Accordingly, data analysis can be categorised into theoretical analysis and methodological analysis. As explained in Chapter 3, theoretical analysis of this current research was undertaken by contextualising findings with Hearn's (2012) framework of power, other relevant theories and empirical literature. The outcome of this theoretical analysis will be presented in Chapter 5, 6 and 7. Methodological analysis, which is detailed in this chapter, was conducted by means of two techniques: domain analysis and code creation. Before explaining the ways in which I employed them in detail, it is useful to give an overview of the entire process of methodological data analysis.

It was necessary that data analysis was initiated before data collection was completely finished. The reason for this is to gradually narrow down the focus of research so that the questions to pose and the topics to investigate deeply in the second phase of data generation can be specified according to emerging themes. The decision on what is investigated further and from whom further data are collected is often determined by initial results of data collection (Silverman, 2013). This research was progressed in the data-oriented and sequential manner. In other words, the overlap of data collection and data analysis accorded with the inductive principle of this research. Silverman (2011) indicates the importance of inductive approaches by emphasising that even research that is driven by pre-determined concepts requires close familiarity with what is actually happening in a field studied. Those who are to be sampled next continually change since such selection depends on emerging themes (Teddlie and Yu, 2007). I therefore needed to identify emerging themes as I gathered data in order to decide who was going to be approached in subsequent stages. In data collection too, themes to be investigated deeply in semi-structured interviews were dependent upon themes identified in participant observation. In other words, in order to select who to approach and which theme to study more deeply, I needed to know what was going on even in the middle of data collection. This is why data analysis began to be conducted before data collection was completely finished.

However, the fact that qualitative analysis was started in the middle of data collection does not mean that the analysis was overall entirely inductive. It was difficult and unnecessary to avoid the impact of my own biography and preconceived ideas on the research outcomes. As noted at the very outset of this chapter, interpretivist-constructivist research takes reflexivity for granted, and hence does not refrain from subjectively interpreting studied phenomena (McIlveen, 2008). Indeed, I analysed Open Gardens through my own interpretive lenses that reflected on the research outcome. It is true that the present research neither examined any hypothesis nor used a previously developed code list. From a pragmatist perspective, however, it is extremely unrealistic to analyse qualitative data in a purely inductive way (Goreluck, 2010). I was not completely innocent when scanning my fieldnotes and transcripts. As Schwandt (2007) indicates, the analysis of this research is inductive in the sense that it rejects the *hypothetico-deduction* that typically underpins the natural scientific research. In practice, inductive and deductive approaches often go hand in hand (Schadewitz and Jachna, 2007).

The whole procedure of methodological data analysis was roughly classified into two strands: domain analysis and creation of codes. Domain analysis was conducted to categorise emerging themes. Code creation was undertaken to fully comprehend what the emerging themes were, by more rigorously defining them. Whilst domain analysis was initiated prior to the creation of codes, the former was continually reviewed based upon the latter, and vice versa. Since both of them were mutually influential, it was difficult to differentiate one from another in chronological order. Practical ways in which I carried them out will be explained in more detail in the subsequent subsections.

4.7.1. Domain analysis

One of the key elements of qualitative data analysis is to find patterns in qualitative data (Saldaña, 2015). I read my fieldnotes and interview transcripts again and again, and annotated them. Repeating this process made me realise there are some repetitively emerging opinions and behaviours, and that some of them shared commonalities. In order to group them by homogeneity, I employed domain analysis.

Domain analysis is a process of searching for themes in the cultural scenes investigated, and of grouping the cultural themes according to commonalities they have (Spradley, 1980). Domain analysis is designed to elicit knowledge of how individuals or groups of individuals perceive the cultural scenes and their action (Bernard and Ryan, 2010), and is the first type of analysis to be employed in the sequence of fieldwork in order to establish a baseline understanding of what is going on (Onwuegbuzie, Leech and Collins, 2012).

Let me demonstrate the way in which I practically employed domain analysis. One of the questions that emerged during the first phase of fieldwork was ‘Who are the people to whom I talked in Open Gardens?’. In order to identify people that I met, I gave them labels by inserting comments in my fieldnotes (Appendix 5). As a result, it was realised that there are five principal types of people in the Open Gardens: garden openers, helpers, volunteers, workers of SG and visitors. To accommodate this principal type, a domain ‘People in the Open Gardens’ was created. A cultural domain internalises other small categories that are called sub-domains (Spradley, 1980). The domain ‘People in the Open Gardens’ consisted of five sub-domains which were for each of the aforesaid five kinds of people. The classification was developed in this manner and was visualised in the form of a box diagram (See Table 4).

Table 4
Example for domain and sub-domain

People in the Open Gardens				
Garden Opener	Helper	Volunteer	Worker of SG	Visitor

Another important element of qualitative data analysis is to articulate interrelationships between identified patterns in qualitative data (Saldaña, 2015). Domains often incorporate relational structures (e.g. domain A is bigger than, better than or same colour as, domain B) (Borgatti, 1998; Carballo-Cárdenas, Mol and Tobi, 2013; Coole, Brooks and Treagust, 2015). The box diagrams that illustrated categorisations of cultural domains were further developed and made more precise by seeking the internal structure of the domains. For instance, considering the fact that the garden openers, helpers, volunteers and the staff of SG are all kinds of

people who collaboratively produce Open Gardens, they were named ‘Producers’ and were clearly differentiated from visitors who consume the services that the producers offer. This differentiation was based on the producer-consumer relationship (see Table 5).

Table 5
Example for taxonomy

People in the Open Gardens				
Producers				Consumer
Garden Opener	Helper	Volunteer	Worker of SG	Visitor

In this research, not only internal relationships within a domain, but also inter-domain links assisted the researcher with the further development of categorisation and the identification of cultural patterns. For example, in searching for a different domain called ‘Ways in which the garden opener asks for help’, it became clear that some openers pay their helpers. Accordingly, new subsets ‘The paid’ and ‘The unpaid’ were created, which are included in the larger category ‘Helper’ (see Table 6).

Table 6
Example for inter-domain relationship

People in the Open Gardens					
Producers				Consumer	
Garden Opener	Helper		Volunteer	Worker of SG	Visitor
	Paid	Unpaid			

As demonstrated above, themes were identified by undertaking domain analysis. Domain analysis assisted the classification of cultural patterns. Even though this analysis was useful to gain a rough idea of what was going on in Open Gardens, it was unclear what the cultural meanings of categorised domains actually were. This vagueness stemmed from nuances that existed in respondents’ subjectivity. Bernard (2011) addresses this point by offering an example of colour - for some people across the world, such as some of the South African people whose mother tongue is Xhosa, green and blue are regarded as an identical colour. Japanese people too commonly call a green traffic light ‘blue (*ao* in Japanese)’. These exemplify a potential variation in definitions of colour, and demonstrate that people in different cultural groups organise their knowledge differently. Bernard and Ryan (2010) offers another example - an animal species that visitors to a zoo call ‘monkeys’ may be labelled by

zoologists 'apes'. This illustrates that even if people refer to the same thing, it can be labelled, defined and categorised differently.

In this research too, categorisations developed by domain analysis sometimes did not completely clarify nuanced differences in the ways in which my respondents labelled specific types of people, things or actions. For example, by 'helper' I meant those who were not garden openers, but were present in Open Gardens and were in charge of entrance administrations, sale of plants or catering services. However, some people that I labelled 'helpers' called themselves 'volunteers' because they helped garden openers without gaining any salary or payment. This was confusing because the staff of SG meant 'volunteer' when they referred to unpaid workers who were appointed as District Organisers, Area Organisers, Treasurers or Trustees. I needed to carefully consider this kind of inconsistency in my respondents' terminology because definitions of each domain and sub-domain must agree with respondents' perspectives (Weller and Romney, 1988). There was a remarkable difference between what I labelled 'helper' and 'volunteer', but domain analysis is by nature not very concerned with the definition of categorised domains. It was therefore still difficult to call such domains 'themes' with certainty. This lack of confidence to clearly explain about the domains led me to deliberately articulate their definitions and descriptions. This was the objective of another strand of data analysis, that is to say, the creation of codes.

4.7.2. Creation of codes

Coding is to define segments of data about which one researches, with short names or labels that succinctly summarise and explain each piece of data (Boeije, 2010). As Gibbs (2007) points out, the idea of a code appears to be mysterious because there is no consensus amongst researchers on the definition of a 'code'. A code is a label that depicts the very salient feature of a cultural pattern or meaning (Boeije, 2010). A code therefore more successfully and rigorously captures the core characteristic of a cultural pattern so that the cultural pattern is more accurately understood to the extent that it is identified as a theme.

The process of coding was carried out in accordance with Boyatzis's (1998) guidance on code creation. The rationale behind this choice is that Boyatzis understands a code as a rigorous definition and description of a cultural pattern, such as what it is concerned with, how it emerged or how it is different from others. This stance agrees with my understanding of code explained above. As frequently noticed in qualitative data analysis, it was inefficient to create codes of all cultural themes at once because of the large amount of data, (Bryman, 2012). Therefore, as Silverman (2011) suggests, the amount of raw data was reduced by extracting excerpts of narratives relevant to a specific theme so that codes were created point by point. The extracted fieldnotes and transcripts were spread out on a noticeboard and were read repeatedly, which further enhanced my familiarity with the data set. Carefully comparing the narratives of each case, subtle differences amongst them became recognisable. After conceptually processing the data set, codes were written down and developed. Following Boyatzis's (1998) guidelines, each code comprised a label, definition, indicators, examples and exclusions.

Let me use 'showing off', which is one of the identified motivations for opening gardens to the public, as an illustrative example of coding. There seemed to me at least four reasons why a garden opener's intention to display their garden began to seem particularly important in this research. First, in Open Gardens there were often materials that offered some explanation of the gardens. This included maps, pictures, leaflets or books written by garden openers. A new domain 'Things in the garden' was created and it was aimed to list all kinds of materials used to announce the gardens. Second, some openers to whom I talked expressed their concern about visitors' opinion of what they saw, and also about satisfying the visitors' expectations. Third, some of the visitors who did not open their gardens showed much admiration for gardens open to the public, and expressed that being able to open is something they could not achieve or afford. Fourth, I perceived a certain sensitivity around showing off. Some of the garden openers with whom I conversed realised that it played a part and seemed afraid of prompting antipathy against attention-seeking or status signalling. Because of these background contexts, my curiosity about the different perceptions of showing off was further aroused.

Nevertheless, it was quite unclear what ‘showing off’ actually is. Good codes succinctly reflect research subjects’ subjective views (Fereday and Muir-Cochrane, 2008). What would openers like to show off? Why do they want to show off? How is showing off different from simply showing? How do different kinds of people perceive showing off or showing? How is showing off or showing interwoven with other emerging themes? These questions all remained unresolved. In order to grasp the object of, the rationale behind and different people’s perception of showing off, code creation was carried out.

Table 7 shows the code named ‘Showing (off) horticultural achievements (ShoHA)’. It was very difficult to differentiate showing off from showing. This was because in general the phrase ‘show off’ has a rather negative connotation, but whether a way in which one shows others his or her garden is annoying depends on personal and subjective judgement. Therefore, I decided to include the term ‘off’ in a parenthesis, rather than creating another code. In keeping with the ways in which ShoHA was presented in the field, indicators and examples were given too. Considering the

Table 7	
Example for code	
Label	Showing (off) horticultural achievements (ShoHA)
Definition/description	A kind of motivation for opening where the openers want to display what they have achieved to others. If the degree of vanity or exhibitionism is high or if it is expressed in a conspicuous manner that others find annoying, attracting other people's attention, it might be interpreted as 'showing off'.
Indicators	The use of terms such as 'show', 'display', 'exhibit' or 'show off'. The act of talking about horticultural awards one won before. In physical forms, sometimes there are reading materials that openers leave in their garden to let the visitors know about the gardens. This is named 'Announcement' and has different forms such as map, flyer, book and picture. It might also occasionally presented in the garden design.
Examples	I think she likes... she likes to display her work (Bhagwanti); Because I want to show off... I do want other people to see it (Angela)
Exclusion	Differentiate ShoHA from Sho ideas (ShoI) and Showing other objects (ShoOO)

object of display, ShoHA was distinguished from other similar codes such as 'Showing ideas to others (ShoI)' that was a code for some openers' intention to show others the ways in which they developed their gardens.

Once codes were created, the raw data were revisited to examine the applicability of each code, which accords with Fereday and Muir-Cochrane's (2008) suggestion. Rigorously determined codes pointed out only the most important part of a theme and made the data easily comparable (Charmaz, 2014). As the number of created codes increased, code lists were made and developed in the form of box diagram. The code lists were, as Gibbs (2007), King (1998) and Ritchie and Lewis (2003) recommend, also modified continuously until differences between similar codes were clearly articulated. A significant criterion for the organisation of code lists was the size of the code. Practically, in the case that a code has a long definition, long descriptions or a number of different examples, it was deliberately divided into two or three smaller categories because such codes covered domains that were too broad. When this happened, domain analysis was also revisited and revised by separating or unifying domains.

In summary, the qualitative data analysis was undertaken in two strands. One of them was domain analysis. Domains, or patterns occurring in cultural scenes under investigation, were categorised according to their characteristics. Even though this procedure helped me to establish baseline understandings of what was going on in Scottish Open Gardens, it was not sufficient to help me to comprehend what the identified domains actually were. For this reason, as another strand of data analysis, codes were created for each of the identified domains. In accordance with Boyatzis' (1998) guidelines, each code comprised label, definition, description, indicator, example and exception. The created codes were continually reviewed in order to examine their applicability to raw data. The results of domain analysis are shown in Appendix 9-13, and the created codes are presented in Appendix 14-61. Each code will also be referred to in findings chapters where relevant.

4.8. Data verification and trustworthiness

I now explain how I verified qualitative data. The criterion of the evaluation of

qualitative research which has been regarded as analogous to the more quantitative concept of validity is trustworthiness (Shaw, 1999). It is defined as “the quality of an investigation (and its findings) that made it noteworthy to audiences” (Schwandt, 2007: 299). The foregoing is explanations of how the trustworthiness of this research was enhanced, and also how I verified data gathered by the three ways of data collection, that is, documentary analysis, participant observation and semi-structured interview.

Data gained from documentary analysis were verified by asking the authors of data sources (Brimblecombe, 2014). I double-checked with the staff of SG on the dating of some milestones in the historical development of Scottish Open Gardens. However, the current staff of SG were not entirely sure about it because they were not the authors of the dated documents that I had consulted. An alternative measure to verify documentary data is cross-validation within different sources that record the same event (Himmelsbach, Glaser, Schoenbein, Riemann and Martin, 2015). I examined the accuracy of the dating of historical events of Scottish Open Gardens by consulting four kinds of documents (see 4.6.1).

The way in which I verified data collected by participant observations was member validation. Member validation, which is also known as respondent validation or member checks (Hignett and McDermott, 2015), is a way to seek corroboration by providing people about whom the research is conducted with research findings (Bryman, 2016). For example, one of the respondents who has opened her country house garden over several decades told me that she had been bothered by carvings on trees in the garden, and showed me the damaged trees. I first assumed that the mistreatment was caused by garden visitors who paid for entry to her garden when it was open for SG. However, she later informed me by email that the garden is open on a daily basis free of charge throughout the year, and ill-mannered local kids sometimes wandered around in the garden and, according to her, caused the damage to the tree. Member validation aims to assess the accuracy of respondents’ subjectivity (Koelsch, 2013), and, as discussed in 4.7.1, the outcome of qualitative analyses have to agree with respondents’ perspectives (Bernard, 2011; Bernard and

Ryan, 2010; Weller and Romney, 1988). This experience made me revisit the domain named 'The de-motivation for opening the garden to the public' (Appendix 12), and exclude her case from this category.

I also used member validation to enhance the trustworthiness of data gathered by semi-structured interviews. Member validation of interviews is not a standardised method to be used blindly in every research occasion, but rather is used to address specific questions relevant to themes emerging when analysing data (Buchbinder, 2011). I used member validation not only to enhance the accuracy of respondents' comments, but also to deepen the understanding of topics relevant to Open Gardens. For example, when I interviewed a District Organiser who was in charge of a depopulated area in the Scottish Borders, she brought up the way in which she inspects gardens' quality. I was not entirely sure whether she performs that task in a strict way, and hence later asked her by email whether she has ever refused garden owners opening, and also whether she has ever requested garden owners to make changes to their gardens to bring them up-to-standard. She answered that she has refused a couple of garden owners opening on account of the garden size and parking facilities, but has never requested them to make changes to their gardens. She further commented as follows: "I am not the strictest on choosing gardens, mainly because we live in such an under populated area and not many people come forward to offer to open up. In England, it is totally different. There are people queuing to open and quite often refused". Her comment helped me understand the degree to which she inspects and selects gardens in accordance with the guideline of SG. This post-investigation method of conducting member validation also enabled me to examine my own interpretation (Torrance, 2012). I interpreted her comment as a dilemma of maintaining a certain quality of gardens open to the public in her region, or of failing to guarantee a certain quantity of gardens in the depopulated region. This will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 6.

Another concern with regard to the verification of interview data was about transcription. The trustworthiness of transcriptions is a criterion that partially determines the quality of qualitative research (Poland, 1995). Since the semi-

structured interviews were carried out in English, which is not my first language, significant attention was required when transcribing interview data in order to accurately present what my respondents said. It is highly recommended to work with a transcriber not only because transcribing is a demanding process (Bird, 2005), but also because the accuracy of transcripts establishes the trustworthiness of qualitative research (Stucky, 2014). After transcribing interviews by myself, the transcriptions that I had anticipated would be directly quoted in the thesis were checked by my associates who are native English speakers. Once certain decisions regarding which parts of the interviews would be directly quoted in the thesis were made, they were double-checked and re-transcribed by professional transcribers whose first language is English. They transcribed the selected narratives in intelligent verbatim style. Intelligent verbatim transcription is to accurately transcribe what respondents said, but omit too many repetitions such as ‘um...’ or ‘erm...’ to maintain reading momentum (Hickley, 2007). Selectivity is not only a practical necessity, but also a theoretical rigour, as transcribing the entire interviews might obscure the research objective. Therefore, selective transcriptions ensure that the research is orientated towards its goal, as far as possible (Davidson, 2009). The trustworthiness of interview data was established in this way in co-operation with professional transcribers.

To establish trustworthiness, different strategies were employed according to methods of data collection. Data collected by documentary analysis were verified by means of cross validation within multiple sources that document the historical development of Open Gardens. Data gathered by participant observation were verified by member validation. In order to enhance the accuracy of my account of observed phenomena, I asked my respondents to clarify their perspectives. Member validation also assisted to verify data generated by semi-structured interviews. After interviews, some interviewees were asked to expand on their views, opinions or comments where necessary. In addition, the accuracy of transcripts was enhanced by working with professional transcribers because this was considered as an important element in maximising the trustworthiness of qualitative research. In addition to trustworthiness, the quality of research is also defined by how it manages ethical

issues. This point will be explained in detail in the next section.

4.9. Ethical considerations

The final section of this chapter discusses ethical considerations. Different methods of data collection and analysis during fieldwork had different risks of ethical issues. Therefore, ethical concerns relevant to participant observation, semi-structured interviews and data organisation (including fieldnotes and interview transcripts) are separately discussed below.

One of the major concerns to which I paid close attention when conducting participant observation was the principle of ‘non-maleficence’, as social research could be recognised by research subjects as disturbance, inconvenience or even harm (Israel, 2015). Unlike myself, other visitors in Open Gardens enjoyed observing plants and chatting to each other over some refreshments as leisure or tourism pursuits. I refrained from obviously taking notes and photographing in the presence of other visitors on predetermined public open days to respect the relaxing atmosphere of Open Gardens. When casually conversing with garden openers and other kinds of people present in the gardens, they often asked me what I was doing there. As the British Sociological Association (2002) advises, I honestly informed my respondents who I was and what I was doing, without pretending to be someone else. During observations, I never secretly audio-, or video-recorded what was going on because, as Sharma (2009) warns, such covert investigation may ruin the relationship between the researcher and the researched. I always brought research information sheets on which my name, contact details, affiliation and explanation of this research were shown (Appendix 6), and gave a copy to people with whom I conversed during participant observation. Whilst most of the people that I encountered were friendly, cooperative and interested in my research, a minority of people took an instant dislike to me and my research. When this happened, I stopped talking, and tried not to disturb them.

Ethical concerns over semi-structured interviews included informed consent. Flick (2009) explains that gaining consent should not be so difficult if the researcher tries to obtain it from somebody in a similar social stratification, e.g. social class, age

group, educational level, etc. I confidently predicted that people involved in Open Gardens would be different from myself in terms of nationality, age and cultural background, and so much attention was paid to how I sought consent. Informed consent is meaningless unless it clearly explains what the respondents are consenting to (Miller and Bell, 2012). Based on Wiles' (2013) suggestion, the interview consent form included the purpose, methods and intended possible uses of the research and how I intended to use the data gathered from the participants (Appendix 7). The research information sheet was also attached to emails when requesting participation in the interview via email. In the case where a potential respondent's email was not available, I sent them an interview request letter and put a copy of the research information sheet that is different from the above-mentioned one in terms of design (Appendix 8). This was because the letter was used mostly for people I had not met before and I supposed that something visually more attractive would work better to attract their attention. When semi-structured interviews were conducted, informed consent and their signature were requested face to face. When semi-structured interviews were carried out over the phone, oral consent was accepted.

The principle of non-maleficence (Israel, 2015) was considered in semi-structured interviews too. In order to minimise or alleviate trouble or distress that my respondents could suffer, interviews with them were planned to be conducted at their gardens, unless garden openers suggested a different place such as a cafe. As the Social Research Association (2003) emphasises, it was also important to tell participants that they are not required or forced to participate in interviews. Research should be dependent upon voluntary participation (Fisher and Anushko, 2008), and hence respondents were informed at the beginning of each interview that they have an entitlement to refuse participation at any stage for whatever reason. In these ways, consent was gained from all of those who agreed to participate in semi-structured interviews.

Participant observation and semi-structured interviews were followed by the organisation of qualitative data for analysis. The ethical concern about this process was the respondents' privacy. The British Sociological Association (2002) officially

advises in its statement of ethical practice that the respondent's anonymity and confidentiality must be respected. Assurance of confidentiality was thought to be important because it could function to build trust with my research participants (Kaiser, 2009). Where respondents referred to the specific name of somebody, the names were replaced by pseudonyms when writing up fieldnotes or transcribing verbal data so that they would be kept anonymised. Names of specific localities were bracketed and shown as [name of locality] so that respondents' privacy would not be disclosed. More precisely, this could effectively breach internal confidentiality (Tolich, 2004). A common name itself might not indicate a specific individual. However, if a name is referred in a specific context, it may not be difficult for members of a small community to identify who the person is (Prosser and Loxley 2008). For example, the name 'John' does not specify an individual because, presumably, there are numerous males whose name is 'John'. However, if a respondent refers to 'John' and 'Galashiels', which is a town in the Scottish Borders, it might not be difficult for local garden openers in the town to identify him. As Steffen (2015) notes, some research informants may rather want to be identifiable, but none of my respondents expressed such an interest. I therefore tried to guarantee privacy, anonymity and confidentiality as much as I could.

In order to ensure data security, the master copies of fieldnotes, pictures taken in the field, audio files of recorded interviews and interview transcripts were all saved in the university's online data store. Saving research data in online cloud services has been recommended in recent years because they may provide assurance of electronic record recovery from, for instance, computer failure or file corruption (Devereaux and Gottlieb, 2012). These data were backed-up in a USB memory stick and portable HD, and were password protected (Aldridge, Medina and Ralphs, 2010). The data have not been disclosed to other people, except for my supervisors and transcribers. I acknowledge that the protection of confidentiality was limited in my relationship with these kinds of people. Supervisors are, however, primary ethical advisors for PhD students (Fisher, Wertz and Goodman, 2009; Miller, 2012; Richards, 2010). Transcribers can also play a role of advisers when, for example, offering PhD students advice on which pseudonym effectively anonymises research informants

(Wiles, 2013). Therefore, they were not the third party in my research activities, but rather people with whom I consulted when trying to protect research participants' privacy. As declared in the research information sheet (Appendix 6), I have used, and will use, the data exclusively for my research activities.

Finally, it is worth mentioning that ethical issues were not anticipated in the documentary analysis that I conducted. Ethics are raised as a subject to be discussed where consulted documents are not publicly available, such as personal emails (Sixsmith and Murray, 2001). Documents that I analysed to compile the historical development of Open Gardens are all publicly accessible. It is true that some publicly accessible sources include personal information, and hence the protection for privacy needs to be considered. For example, ethics may matter when posts on social network websites are used as sources of documentary analysis (Mauthner, 2012). Indeed, some present and past garden openers or volunteers have listed their personal contact details and postal addresses in the guidebooks and websites. However, such personal information by no means needed to be mentioned to account for the historical development of Open Gardens which was the purpose of my documentary analysis. For these reasons, I did not believe that my documentary analysis would violate the privacy of people who contributed to the historical development of Open Gardens, and did not employ any specific strategies to consider the ethics of my documentary analysis.

I have recounted how I avoided potential disturbance, informed my respondents about this research, gained their consent and guaranteed their privacy. I paid close attention to these points, as I believed that not paying attention to ethical issues might also cause my relationships with respondents to deteriorate. Such a concern, consequently, often made me face a dilemma. In particular, I unwillingly avoided inserting pictures in this thesis although I always photographed Open Gardens during my fieldwork as a matter of course. Even though visual aids are useful techniques to effectively deliver pictorial information on studied phenomena, careful consideration is needed to prevent respondents' privacy from being dislocated (Wiles, Prosser, Bagnoli, Clark, Davies, Holland and Renold, 2008). In this research, not only

humans, but also various kinds of garden features had the potential to indicate to other people where the picture was taken. From a practical point of view, neither pixelating humans nor filling them in black is sufficient to secure their privacy. If the entire picture is pixelated, which I tentatively tried, respondents' privacy is perhaps guaranteed, but it is not easy to visually grasp what the picture depicts. For this reason, I decided not to use photographs in this thesis. Nothing else was more important than the trust-building in my relationship with respondents because this research could not have taken place without their co-operation. I worried that a worst-case scenario might have occurred where no one agreed to be interviewed. Avoiding these ethical issues and building trusting relationships with my respondents were both essential to this research.

4.10. Chapter summary

This chapter provided a detailed explanation of the paradigmatic underpinnings of this research and of the practical methods employed. I premised this research upon interpretivism and constructivism, as epistemological and ontological positions respectively. This decision stemmed from the presumption of subjective interpretation and multiple reality. I then rationalised the selection of multicase study as a research design. Treating each Open Garden as a single case, the research focused upon commonalities and differences amongst multiple cases. In terms of the generalisability of this multicase study research, findings of this research should be applicable to other garden openings in different countries, other garden-related leisure pursuits in which the display of status and power are central issues or to charity-fundraising events. Outcomes of this current research are therefore transferrable to a broad range of relevant phenomena.

I also presented the timeframe of fieldwork and the practical procedures of data generation which included sampling, data collection and data analysis. The whole process of data generation was divided into two phases. The first phase involved familiarising myself with Open Gardens, and gaining a rough idea of what was going on in Scottish Open Gardens. The second phase was for narrowing down the focus on this research and examining emerging themes at a deeper level.

The sampling strategy of this research was a combination of purposive sampling techniques. The technique used at the outset of the first phase was maximum variation sampling. In order to visit as wide a geographical range of gardens as possible, the fieldwork was initially carried out in Open Gardens both in England and Scotland, and then narrowed down to the Lowlands of Scotland. This was because there had been no research that had focused upon Scottish Open Gardens, and filling this gap in knowledge was the principal rationale of this research. It was intended, by limiting the fieldwork location to the Lowlands of Scotland, to provide the data with depth and also to deal with practical issues such as the limited research budget. From a practical viewpoint, convenience sampling was deemed necessary. Convenience sampling is not an ideal rationale, but this was offset by using opportunistic sampling. Selecting research locations and respondents on the basis of geographical convenience was an opportunistic way to flexibly fit in with respondents' schedules. During the second phase of fieldwork, I reached respondents by means of the snowballing technique. This enabled me to identify people relevant to themes that were emerging during fieldwork.

In terms of data collection, I first accounted for how I conducted documentary analysis. Its purpose was to collect accurate information on the historical development of NGS and SG. Whilst the historical sources I consulted offered detailed descriptions of how Open Gardens under the two organisations developed, they did not explain much about the present Open Gardens. This determined and guided the need for fieldwork. Like sampling, data collection was also undertaken inductively. The participant observations were conducted mostly in the first phase of fieldwork in order to gain ideas of what was going on in Open Gardens. The degree of my participation was low because it was not realistic for me to become a complete participant. This was not perceived to be a negative impact of the research, but rather assisted in the search for sensitive topics that would not be disclosed if there was an intimate relationship between myself and respondents. In pursuance of deeper understandings of themes identified in the participant observations, semi-structured interviews were also conducted. Whilst it was important to have and follow a carefully designed fixed interview guide in order to carry out each interview along

the same lines, flexibility was also important to broaden potential directions of research. Hence the intermediate point between inflexibility and flexibility was sought in the interviews.

In terms of qualitative data analysis, I adopted two approaches: domain analysis and the creation of codes. Domain analysis assisted the categorisation of cultural patterns occurring in Open Gardens. Whilst domain analysis helped me to establish baseline understandings of Scottish Open Gardens, understandings of domains or cultural patterns categorised were not developed sufficiently to call them 'themes'. In order to deepen the understanding of the categorised domains or cultural patterns, code creation was carried out. Each code comprised label, definition, description, indicator, example and exception. By systematically creating codes, nuances and subtlety that existed in respondents' subjectivity were more accurately grasped. The created codes were continually reviewed and their applicability to raw data was examined.

Next, I explained how the data were verified. With trustworthiness as a key objective, qualitative data were verified by employing different techniques appropriate for different methods of data collection. Data generated by documentary analysis were verified by means of cross-validation within sources recording the same event. By consulting multiple sources, the accuracy of my account of the historical development of Open Gardens was enhanced. Data collected by participant observation were verified by using member validation. I requested, where necessary, garden openers or their associates that I encountered during fieldwork for some clarification of their views or perspectives. Member validation was also used for the verification of the semi-structured interviews. In addition, the accuracy of transcripts was enhanced by working with professional transcribers as this was considered as an important criterion that partly determines the trustworthiness of qualitative research.

Finally, I covered the ethical considerations of this research. With regard to participant observation, I considered the principle of non-maleficence. Obvious note-taking and photographing were avoided so as not to disturb the atmosphere of Open Gardens. In semi-structured interviews, I primarily paid attention to informed

consent. An explanation of who I am and what this research is about was given to respondents so that they understood the research objective and did not feel as if they were forced to participate in the research. When writing up fieldnotes and transcribing interviews, anonymity was also a matter of concern. Real names of individuals or specific localities were not used to make sure that their personal information would not be disclosed. Photographs that I took during fieldwork were also not used in this thesis, as gardens can be identifiers of their owners and their associates. In order to ensure data security, the master copies of field-notes, pictures taken in the field, audio files of recorded interviews and interview transcripts were all saved in the university's online data store. Respondents were informed that data drawn from fieldwork have been, and will be, used exclusively for my research activities. The data will be kept until journal articles or other kinds of research work that are based upon this thesis are completed.

All of the methods used were part of an overall attempt to more deeply understand the ways in which Open Gardens are co-produced by garden openers and their associates, and the different kinds of power operating in Open Gardens. In the following three chapters, I will discuss findings that were drawn from the data generated by the methods just described.

Chapter 5: Findings on physical power: beyond human-intentionality

To offer a brief overview of the three findings chapters of this thesis, Chapter 5 (this chapter) is concerned with physical power and its importance in the relations between human beings and non-human factors. Chapter 6 will explain social power and its enactments in interpersonal relationships between the co-producers of Scottish Open Gardens. Chapter 7 will focus on some of the garden openers' intention to show off their gardens and the moral justifiability of this act. All of the principal findings reported below will be the basis of contributions to knowledge that I will suggest in the final chapter.

5.1. Introduction

This chapter emphasises the significance of physical power to the production of Scottish Open Gardens, and demonstrates its importance in two different contexts. First, I explore the development of gardens. As explained in Chapter 2, gardens are landscapes in which human beings' encounters with nature are always present because gardens are created by physically transforming natural settings and resources. I feature below the fluidity of the human-nature relations, and illustrate that human beings and nature can be more powerful than each other. Second, I discuss the generation of publicity and highlight its importance as a major factor in the success of marketing. I will describe below how different kinds of media, visitor attractions and weather conditions are entangled with the ways in which garden openers and their associates try to encourage visitors. Finally, in keeping with the impact of non-human elements on the development of gardens and the generation of publicity, I will question the sustainability of human-intentionality. As explained in the section on Actor-Network-Theory (see 3.2.5), the principle of human-intentionality has conventionally been seen as definitional of agency. The ultimate aim of this section is to argue that non-human elements should not be eliminated from the scope of analysis.

5.2. Development of gardens and human-nature relations

The development of gardens is a crucial task performed by garden openers or employed gardeners, and is a context in which human beings are required to control or deal with natural forces. In the first instance, I introduce some narratives to

demonstrate how nature is perceived by human beings who produce Scottish Open Gardens. The excerpt below is taken from a conversation between myself and an employed gardener Keith who was in charge of a castle garden in Fife.

Interviewer: So what kind of preparation did you do beforehand, before the open day?

Keith: Before the opening day it's simple things like hedges cut, grass cut, edges cut, flowers tied if they're flopping over, pruning the flowers. And really try to make sure that everything's in bloom on that one day.

Interviewer: Is it possible?

Keith: It is possible, yes. Yeah it is. A lot of it is being very very lucky with the weather. But it's basically keeping things tidy for the people who come round on that day.

Interviewer: Okay, so you have to make the garden tidy.

Keith: Very tidy for that one day.

Interviewer: And hedges must be well trimmed.

Keith: It's a bit difficult with these hedges here because these hedges only get pruned once a year. So it's normally at the beginning of the season. Because of the way that this garden is laid out, you couldn't prune this hedge without going into the hibiscus border, so the plants up the side, without making more mess than having a scruffy hedge. So a lot of people let the hedges slip by. They don't really notice the hedges cause they're looking too much at the plants.

This comment illustrates human beings' physical 'power over' nature. Keith found it possible to make flowers bloom at the preferred time, which is demonstrative of his physical power to make the intended outcome happen in the garden. In the garden of which Keith is in charge, he perceives himself to be more powerful than, and confident in control over, nature. Human domination over nature has been seen as one of the meanings of garden (Riley, 1990). Gardens are quasi-natural settings (Mausner, 1996). People tend the gardens, as a matter of course, by making a wide range of modifications to the natural settings, such as pruning plants or trimming topiaries. What many of the garden openers with whom I conversed were willing to tell me in their gardens was the ways in which they developed their gardens. For instance, one of them explained how he created an artificial pond in his garden: digging the ground, making a hole, placing a vinyl sheet in the hole, covering it with

soil and installing an electric pump so that water could be cycled automatically. These kinds of artificiality and non-natural arrangements of natural resources represent human dominance over nature (Janick, 2014). Successful gardening done before public open days can therefore be characterised by humans' more powerful status than that of nature. Nevertheless, this human 'power over' nature is episodic, which contradicts, as Hearn (2012) explains, the nature of domination. Hearn (2011) states that "Relations of domination are, by definition, firmly established, and often naturalized and taken for granted" (203). In other words, nature can be rather more powerful than human beings, which is discussed more carefully below.

It is debatable whether human beings are definitively and absolutely more powerful than nature. Gardens are outside settings that the weather conditions can dynamically affect. The following comment made by a garden opener called Anita illustrates how nature can physically influence the extent to which she feels confident in her garden.

Anita: No, no! I'm always quite apprehensive actually that my garden is going to be up to scratch. You know, because our climate is so erratic. We get early springs, we get late springs, we get wet springs. And I'm always quite nervous that my tulips are going to bloom at the right time... I sometimes, always have to apologise. (Laughs) And in fact, when the Scottish Garden Scheme asked me to open I said it will not be a weed-free garden.

Contrary to Keith's case, Anita's perspective demonstrates that nature certainly has physical 'power over' human beings in some cases. Anita further mentioned that her collection of tulips all died of a fungal disease called 'tulip fire'. This is one example of how human beings sometimes fail to have control over nature. Hitchings (2003) explains that human-nature relations in the garden can be characterised by the ever-shifting locus of power. Both human beings and nature can be more powerful than one another. Thus, in gardens, dominant actors can change from situation to situation. The climate in Scotland caused Anita's lack of confidence in her garden, and other garden openers amongst my interviewees showed the same difficulty in dealing with unexpected scenarios caused by unfavourable weather conditions (Appendix 50). Of course, nature provides gardens with positive impacts and essential benefits as well as negative influences. In other words, gardening can be challenging when people

cannot take advantage of nature, which is exemplified by the following dialogue between two garden openers and myself.

Interviewer: Could you just tell me what motivations you have? Charity could be one of them. Probably, you could tell me... sort of enjoyment or pleasure you obtain from garden opening.

Agnes: It's stressful. (Laugh)

Bridget: It's stressful. (Laugh)

Interviewer: Stressful? That's very... honest.

Agnes and Bridget: Yes! (Laugh)

Agnes: Yes it is. Because you don't know what your neighbours are doing, ones that are participating. Also you perhaps buy more than you would normally in a way of plants. So it's more expensive... There's a sort of undercurrent of ... competitiveness.

Bridget: That we didn't expect somehow. Agnes has got a more challenging garden, because you (Agnes) don't have so much sunshine. So you (indicating myself) notice that Agnes has got absolutely lovely bits and pieces, but...

This dialogue suggests the lack of sunshine as an important analytical point. Agnes' garden could not benefit from lots of sunshine. They lived in a two-storeyed house that included two separate flats at different levels. Agnes lived in the basement flat, and had many different kinds of plants on the outside stairs leading to her flat. The stairs were, however, often shaded so that it was difficult for Agnes to grow plants. Power (2005) argues that gardens are a hybrid creation of humans and plants. In Power's (2005) paper, plants are sometimes described in active sentences, such as "These plants recommended themselves to the gardeners... they also altered the appearance of the gardens" (48). The lack of sunshine may therefore be viewed as reduced assistance to the garden creation.

Natural conditions also influence, according to other respondents, the arrangement of open days and the number of visitors. One of the garden openers that I talked to during the first phase of fieldwork recalled an early summer opening when there was nobody to visit her garden due to unexpected heavy snow. Tourism is an earthy endeavour in which nature can significantly impact tourists' mobility (Jóhannesson, van der Duim and Ren, 2012; van der Duim, Ren and Jóhannesson, 2013). Merriman

(2015) explains that mobility is a plural concept that involves both humans and non-humans. Human mobility is occasionally restricted by non-human parameters, namely, nature. The vagaries of the weather represent an important factor where garden openers and other parties involved in the production of Open Gardens may feel powerless.

It is not just weather that affects openers: animals also possess physical ‘power to’ influences openers’ intentions to develop or maintain their gardens. Some garden openers that I interviewed mentioned animals that eat the plants growing in the gardens. When talking to one of the garden openers in his garden, I was shown a couple of apples pecked-at, according to the opener, by blackbirds. Similarly, in another garden, I observed a twisted net surrounding a vegetable plot. According to the opener, foxes dug-up the ground and forced their way into the plot to eat vegetables. The physical influence or damage caused by variable weather conditions and animals, and fungal infections all demonstrate that the creation and development of gardens are to some extent dependent on forces of nature and its inhabitants. Nature can therefore be more powerful than human beings.

The above narratives indicate that non-human forces are inextricably intertwined with the production of Open Gardens. As Panelli’s (2010) advocacy of ‘more than human social geography’ typifies, non-human elements have drawn a wide range of scholarly attention in power discourses, and many of the theoretical schools of this kind are, as explained in 3.2.5, intellectual legacy of Actor-Network-Theory (van der Duim, 2007). In garden-related contexts, it is not only nature (or, more specifically, plants), but also technology that has been studied as an important non-human agent (Hitchings, 2004). As explained in more detail below, some kinds of non-human factors are sometimes collectively called ‘materiality’. This terminology is preferred by those who problematise anthropocentric approaches to human experiences by seriously studying visible and tangible non-human elements (Knappett and Malafouris, 2008). The following section explains how non-human factors influence the ways in which human beings collaboratively produce Scottish Open Gardens. The specific subject I am going to discuss is the (in)applicability of human-

intentionality, which conventionally defines ‘agency’, to Scottish Open Gardens. The discussion focuses upon the ways in which garden openers and other associates generate the publicity of Open Gardens. In the next subsection, I discuss the meaning of ‘non-humans’ more deeply, and demonstrate its influence in the context of the generation of publicity.

5.3. Non-human elements, materiality and the generation of publicity

By ‘non-humans’, I do not exclusively mean nature and its inhabitants, but also materiality that influences the co-production of Scottish Open Gardens. This understanding is supported by Godelier’s (2011) idea of ‘five kinds of materiality’. The first type of materiality refers to nature wholly untouched by human intervention; the second is nature that is modified on account of human presence, but indirectly and unintentionally; the third is the part of nature which is intentionally transformed by humans; the fourth is natural materials that are turned by human beings into instruments such as tools or weapons, and the fifth is what we conventionally call the ‘built-environment’ such as houses, statues or fountains. Materiality thus varies in quality according to the extent to which nature is modified (Godelier, 2011). I have already explained above the impact of weather conditions upon the quality of gardens open to the public and the number of visitors. Weather is considered as the first type of materiality because it is not controllable. Animals that eat plants and fruit were also mentioned. These may be seen as the second type, as there is a possibility that some of the animals were domesticated and were not purely wild. The impact of the first and second types of materiality is already obvious, but there is still room for (quasi-)contrived forms of materiality or non-human forces to be examined. Their significance is explored below through the context of generating publicity.

Generating publicity is a major factor in the successful marketing of Scottish Open Gardens. In order to publicise garden openings widely, gardens are advertised through different types of media. The most traditional way to generate publicity is through the SG’s official guidebook. This book has been recognised as being equivalent to ‘The Yellow Book’, the widely-known guidebook of the NGS which was the forerunner of Open Gardens. In fact, some people also refer to the guidebook

of SG as 'The Yellow Book'. Indeed, Connell (2005) treats the Scottish guidebook as one of the 'Yellow Books'. The name 'The Yellow Book' is used by horticultural enthusiasts as an alias for the guidebook. In its webpage (accessed on 14th June 2016), the National Garden's Scheme calls the book "the so-called bible of garden visiting". Nowadays, the website of SG enables people to find gardens to visit more easily by selecting regions and dates convenient for them. The website is similar to the guidebook in the sense that both of them advertise Scottish Open Gardens nationwide.

Open Gardens under the auspice of SG are also publicised locally, and this is a task performed not only by the organisation, but also by garden openers and volunteer organisers (see Appendix 38). For example, Scotland's Gardens (SG) commissions volunteer organisers to distribute different marketing materials to appropriate places such as local shops, information boards or Open Gardens. In addition to such a top-down strategy, some garden openers advertise their own Open Gardens in their own ways such as social networking sites. Both the distribution of marketing materials and posted announcements in social networking sites are efforts to increase the number of visitors and, consequently, the amount raised for charity. The above-listed wide range of media and marketing materials that generate publicity of gardens are all significant, as they determine the number of visitors and the amount of donations raised for charity, and, ultimately, are all non-human factors.

There is no guarantee, however, that their efforts to publicise their Open Gardens will be effective. For example, an opener called Jock told me that he has won awards for the best garden in a local competition for the last three years. After the interview, I searched the Internet for the information on the awards that he said he had received, and indeed he was featured as one of the winners of 'Gold Plaques' of his district's Council Gardens Competition. The 2014 guidebook of SG also clearly states that "the owner has won '[his district] Gardener of the Year' prize 3 times" (SG, 2014: 162). Competition systematically defines one's power and its legitimacy (Hearn, 2013, 2012). According to Swedberg and Agevall (2005), one of the ways to legitimise one's powerfulness in competitions is by experts' judgements. Thus, the

fact that he has won horticultural competitions presupposes his 'power to' create excellent gardens. Despite his public achievements and successful reputation as a horticulturalist, he had difficulty in encouraging visitors.

Interviewer: Was there anything difficult?

Jock: Getting people to turn up. That's the only problem. Apart from that, it's not a problem.

Interviewer: So how many visitors you get both two days?

Jock: Well there were two on Saturday and about twenty on Sunday. So not very many.

Interviewer: So how do you try to deal with that problem?

Jock: Well, I put up posters and... I hand out leaflets at work to anybody that's interested. Put it on Facebook. Put it on Twitter. It's in the book of course. But that's all you can do really. There's nothing else.

Despite Jock's efforts to publicise his own Open Garden, the total number of visitors to his garden over a weekend in 2014 was 22, which is very low. According to an internal document called Garden Results & District Totals (SG, 2013), Jock's Open Garden raised £200, which was less than half the average of his district (£567.90). Swedberg and Agevall (2005) explain that another way in which competitions legitimately judge one's power is by votes from a concerned constituency. In other words, one's power can be measured according to popularity. One possible cause of the unpopularity of Jock's Open Garden is that his 'Gold Plaque', which can be considered as what Godelier (2011) coins the fourth type of materiality (materials produced from natural resources), did not possess sufficient 'power to' encourage visitors. I am not suggesting that the plaque's inability to attract people was the only factor, since there might have been limitations of the guidebook and Facebook in which his garden and his horticultural achievements were also advertised. If they had been featured on television, for example, there may have been more visitors to his garden. As noted above, television is thought to possess 'power to' determine tourist destinations and motivate people to visit them (Connell, 2005, 2004).

Another possible cause of the unsatisfactory result of Jock's Open Gardens was an absence of convenient and accessible public transport which is recognised by Fox

(2007) as the fifth important reason for not visiting gardens. The nearest train station to Jock's garden (1.3 miles away) is, to quote Jock's own expression, "one of the most abandoned stations in Scotland". On weekdays, there are only two services to the station per day. The train station, which can be considered as the fifth type of materiality in Godelier's (2011) typology (built environment), is not a human being, and hence cannot intend to prevent people from visiting Jock's garden. 'Corporeal mobility' of leisure and tourism is often a hybrid or heterogeneous performance of humans and transportation (Haldrup, 2011; Haldrup and Larsen, 2006). Mobility technologies, such as cars and trains, are therefore central to the enhancement of tourists' experiences, and tourism itself is understood as a desire for movement (Haldrup, 2004). The force that underlies the particularly unsatisfactory result of Jock's public open day can never be explained unless one rejects the principle of human-intentionality.

In a broader sense, publicity is not limited to advertisement, but can include other measures to attract people's attention. Catering and plant sales are the most common services offered in gardens open to the public. Connell (2005) reported that refreshments and plants were sold in the majority of the garden openings to which her survey was distributed (76.8% and 70.2% respectively). In Open Gardens under the auspices of SG, the preparation for, and the sales of, catering services and plant sales on public open days is one of the most important tasks performed by garden openers and their helpers (Appendix 17, 18, 22 and 23). According to the guidebook (SG, 2014), amongst 388 gardens open under SG in 2014, 273 gardens had catering and 277 gardens had plant sales (70.3% and 71.3% respectively). Neither food nor plants are human beings, and therefore they do not have an intention to attract as many visitors as possible. Of course it was garden openers who intentionally provided plant sales and catering to attract visitors, but it is debatable whether plants' and food's unintentional impacts can be completely discounted when investigating the ways in which human beings orientate people's attention to Open Gardens. The comment made by Joceline, who was a garden opener and an Area Organiser, demonstrates how powerful food was as a driving force for garden visits.

Joceline: What I found was quite interesting was... I'd say a lot of people (visitors) were local. But then, there are people who were not local, but the thing that they came for was not the garden, it was for the tea. And I thought that was quite funny. And so it was like they rated the teas. You know, so this was £3... because I think everybody does it differently. So I charged, I think it was £3. And for that you could have whatever you wanted. We just had a big table with cakes and biscuits and everything. And you just take as much as you want - as many cups of tea. But then some people said, "Oh, in some places you go, do you only get one cake?" And so I thought that was quite funny. That was new to me. I didn't expect...

Interviewer: How did you feel about it?.

Joceline: Oh I thought it was quite nice. It made me laugh because there was one man who said, "I never come to the gardens. I just come for the teas". (Laugh)

There are two analytical points regarding this narrative. One is the catering service's role as a motivating factor behind the garden visit. The narrative of the man whose primary interest is not the gardens demonstrates that the refreshments, or, more precisely, the all-you-can-eat policy, encouraged him to visit the garden. Importantly, Fox (2007) reported that amongst visitors to the garden, to which her questionnaire survey was distributed, 30% were enthusiastic gardeners, 59% were willing gardeners and 11% were unwilling gardeners. Since the garden visitors are mostly interested in gardens, the catering seems to be of great significance in extending the range of potential visitors and increasing visitor numbers. Joceline also mentioned pricing and some visitors' views on cost-effectiveness. Compared to the price of tea or coffee in cafes in general, it is cheaper to have refreshments in Open Gardens. The Guidelines for District Organisers (SG, 2012a) articulates that refreshment charges are recommended to be £1.50 for basic tea and biscuits, and £3.00 upwards for homemade cakes and cream teas. The catering service in Joceline's Open Garden was certainly an incentive for some garden visitors. It is arguable that food had sufficient 'power to' draw people's attention, and 'power to' make them visit gardens. In addition to the power of food, it is equally important to consider Joceline's effort. She let the visitors have as much refreshments as they wanted. Thus, she offered the food in the way in which its power is maximised.

The second analytical point regarding the Joceline's narrative is the catering service's involvement in the garden opening experience. Joceline's comment describes that the refreshments shaped an unforgettable part of her garden opening experience and of visitors' experience. Sensory moments shaped by the materiality, such as food or plants, are hybrid experiences that encapsulate one's 'tourism memory' (Franklin, 2003; Haldrup and Larson, 2006). Drawing from a case study on the *oscypek* cheese that is an important tourist attraction in a Polish town called Zakopane, Ren (2011) construes the cheese as a non-human actor that actively enacts and constructs touristic experiences in the destination. The cheese is, Ren further claims, not *being*, but rather *doing*; this is emblematic of a radical ontology in which food is considered as an active partaker in enacting the experience of the tourism destination. Whilst there is room for such anthropomorphic descriptions to be examined more rigorously, the positive impact of food on Scottish Open Gardens should not be excluded from the analysis. I argue that food served in Open Gardens has 'power to' shape experiences of not only visitors, but also of garden openers.

5.4. Chapter summary

This chapter has demonstrated that non-human elements are of significance to Scottish Open Gardens. When developing gardens, humans exercise their physical 'power over' nature as a matter of course. Gardening is therefore understood as a manifestation of humans 'physical power' to transform nature. Nevertheless, I also illustrated that in some occasions nature could be physically more powerful than human beings could. Nature is a possessor of physical 'power to' impact the quality of gardens, the number of visitors and the amount raised for charity, and hence is influential in the co-production of Scottish Open Gardens. My argument for the importance of nature extended to human relations with non-human elements. Inspired by Godelier's (2011) typology, I discussed how materiality was involved in the ways in which co-producers of Scottish Open Gardens generated publicity for their events. Some visitor attractions, such as plant sales or catering services, were identified as powerful incentives for garden visits. I therefore argued that these auxiliary offerings' 'power to' attract and encourage visitors should not be excluded from the scope of analysis. Importantly, such materiality never intends to affect human efforts to encourage visitors. The chapter concluded with the claim that

human-intentionality, which the broad concept of agency conventionally comprises, is not adequate to explain the various kinds of power involved in the co-production of Scottish Open Gardens.

The symmetrical treatment of humans and non-humans is, as explained in Chapter 3, one of the defining characteristics of Actor-Network-Theory. My intention is not to entirely agree with ANT and its intellectual legacies that treat non-human forces as if they are identical to human beings by anthropomorphically describing them as actors that actively engage in human experiences. What I find implausible, however, is the limitation of the scope of analysis to human-intentionality. The singular principle of human-intentionality fails to account for the significant entanglement of non-human factors with human productions of Scottish Open Gardens. Data drawn from fieldwork showed the *de facto* impact of non-human entities, whether employed intentionally or not, on the production of Scottish Open Gardens. This was most notable where physical aspects of power were central issues, such as the transformation of nature or visitors' mobility. Now I shift the focus to the social aspects of power.

Chapter 6: Findings on Social power and interpersonal relationships

In this chapter, I illustrate how social power matters in the interpersonal relationships between the co-producers of Scottish Open Gardens. The first section is concerned with the social power of garden openers. I demonstrate, by investigating their quasi-egalitarian power relationships, the inapplicability of the concept of domination in the interpersonal relationships within Scottish Open Gardens. The second section explores the social power of volunteer organisers. By describing the ways in which they exercise their own ‘power to’ perform various tasks, such as the inspection of gardens, in relation to garden openers and the staff of SG, I explore the concepts of authority and legitimacy, and their application to the interpersonal relationships within Scottish Open Gardens. Drawn from field data, the section illustrates that some of the organisers are reluctant to exercise ‘power over’ garden openers, and are annoyed by the SG’s way of deploying them. Highlighting their emotional account of power relationships with the opener and SG staff, the chapter concludes with an emphasis on the importance of subjective aspects of legitimacy to the production of Scottish Open Gardens.

6.1. Social power of garden openers

This section is concerned with the social power of garden openers. The first section focuses on the garden openers relationships with helpers, and examines the applicability of the concept of domination to their loosely defined power structures. The second section explores the concepts of authority and legitimacy as alternative and more appropriate analytical tools to explain garden openers power and its usage. The section concludes by highlighting the importance of deepening the understanding of authority and legitimacy in the various interpersonal relationships between the co-producers.

6.1.1. Power relationships between garden openers and helpers: Towards limitation of domination

In this subsection, I examine the social power relationship between garden openers and their helpers, and the ways in which the former deploy the latter. Even though garden openers need to tell their helpers to perform different tasks, such as plant sales or catering, it is questionable whether the openers possess absolute ‘power over’

helpers. I demonstrate below, drawing on Hearn's (2012) work, that the openers are not dominant figures in the relationship with helpers. As observed in Parsons' (1957) criticism of Mills' (1956) approach to power, the concept of domination, which denotes completely asymmetrical power structures (Lovett, 2009, 2001) and one side's victory over another (Posthuma, Montes, Rodríguez and Serrano, 2012), is not the only form of power operations. Therefore, the sole use of domination as an analytical instrument can dismiss more nuanced and subtle power operations (see 3.3.3). The section concludes with an argument that the concept of domination does not fully explain their social power relationships.

To begin with, let me exemplify how social power operates in the production of Scottish Open Gardens. The importance of social power in some contexts of Open Gardens can be illustrated by analogy with the importance of physical power (Hearn, 2012). As demonstrated in the previous chapter, gardens are quasi-natural settings where human beings exercise physical power as a matter of course to transform natural resources. Furthermore, the creation of gardens can reflect the social power relationships amongst those who are involved in the production of Scottish Open Gardens. This point is well exemplified by a comment made by a garden opener called Angela.

Angela: Yes I mean that, well, take the example of the gravel. You know, you know what gravel is?

Interviewer: I don't know.

Angela: Gravel is sort of stones. Not this (pointed out stone tiles covering the ground). This is paving. Gravel is loose stones. It's what the paths are made of. Well, you have to buy gravel by about two or three tons. You don't have to buy like that but that's the only way to do it really. And then it's quite a lot of work for the gardeners. Not for me, I don't do it, but to distribute it. It's a quite big operation.

Angela described an operation in which she covered a path in her garden with gravel as a part of the process of developing the garden for open days (Appendix 15). She was not the subject that exercised physical 'power over' nature, and the operation was actually conducted by a professional gardener who she employed. The above narrative is therefore indicative of not only the employed gardeners' physical 'power

to' transform natural settings, but also Angela's social 'power over' the employed gardeners.

As demonstrated in the above narrative, garden openers exercise their social 'power over' other people who assist them with the development of gardens and the preparation for Open Gardens. In particular, garden openers are required to effectively deploy their helpers. For instance, Bhagwanti is one of the helpers that I interviewed. She used to live in the house of a garden opener called Angela, whom I mentioned above, as a residential housekeeper. Despite the fact that Bhagwanti no longer lives there, and does not engage in housekeeping anymore, Angela asked Bhagwanti to come over and sell tickets at the entrance of the garden for no remuneration. One way of interpreting this relationship is that Angela possessed 'power over' Bhagwanti.

Whilst the relationship between Angela and Bhagwanti may exemplify garden openers' control over helpers, it is questionable whether garden openers to whom I talked held complete domination over their helpers. It is useful to recall the rationale behind Parsons' (1957) criticism of Mills (1956) who solely considered the concept of domination as a form of power relationship that was derived from Weber (Bruce and Yearley, 2006). A necessary condition of domination is a power imbalance between two agents (Lovett, 2009, 2001), but power can also be symmetrically distributed to people and hence a power relationship between two agents can be even or balanced (Hearn, 2012). Unlike Bhagwanti, most of the helpers whom I interviewed were garden openers' friends. Garden openers with whom I conversed commonly indicated that they played the role of the leader in their own Open Gardens, and had to direct their friends (helpers) to perform tasks such as catering services or plant sales. However, the friends were different from servants who submissively obeyed orders given by garden openers, and the openers rather asked their friends to help the Open Gardens. This point is more reasonably illuminated by the comment of Leanna, who had opened her garden for 21 years. She stopped opening because of her hesitancy in asking her friends for help.

Leanna: ... we had a dozen friends who every single year, for ten years, came and helped. And I felt, we both felt, [her husband] and me both felt that the time had come where it was really asking a bit much to ask them to do it again and again and again. So we needed three people or four people to man the tea room and do the teas. And we needed somebody here (kitchen) to wash the dishes and cut more cake. We had the plant stall. We had to have somebody on the plant stall, selling the plants. We had a wine table, well, you can't sell wine cause you need a licence. But we were doing it by donation. Glass of wine, £1 donation, thanks very much... so we had somebody manning that. We had to have three people manning cars, parking the cars and making sure there was another space for the next car. And then at the end of it all, I fed everybody. So I was having a big dinner party for 12 people, through there (a dining table) usually, or outside if it was a good day which it generally wasn't. And It was a huge effort, and expensive! So we decided that's it. We've had enough.

An important analytical point to discuss with regard to Leanna's comment is the use of food as an incentive for her friends to volunteer in the gardens. Provision of rewards has been seen as a manifestation of power source (Berger, 2005; Day, 2015). This extract therefore indicates Leanna's possession of 'power to' recruit and deploy her friends in order to orchestrate her own Open Garden. However, it is questionable whether Leanna had absolutely dominated her helpers because she did not exert them unreasonably, but rather treated them with hospitality. Like Leanna, other garden openers with whom I conversed mentioned that they tried to thank them, by offering them, for instance, post-event suppers (Appendix 20). Food is therefore a token of openers' gratitude, and is a display of their efforts to ensure that they are not taking advantage of their friends' kind nature.

This strategy to drum up others' support by offering compensations can be explained by Nye's (2004) concept of 'soft power': the provision of rewards or incentives makes the exercise of power moderate, and makes it easier for the power exerciser to eventually achieve his or her ultimate goal. Indeed, being rewarded with tea, cakes, supper and wine pleased some of the helpers with whom I talked. One of the helpers that I met in a joint-opening was selling refreshments inside a marquee. Interestingly, she was no longer living in that neighbourhood, but came over and helped out because she could eat the cakes for free. Whilst she made that remark in a half-joking manner, it does suggest that providing food and drink is useful in getting helpers to lend a hand. As demonstrated in Leanna's narrative, helpers are not somebody that

garden openers can exploit unconditionally. Garden openers rather request favours from, and show respect and consideration to, their helpers. Politeness can moderate and justify the exercise of social power, and consequently increases productivity (Holmes and Stubb, 2015; Weissblum, 2012). The social power relationships between garden openers and helpers are therefore different from domination that denotes completely imbalanced power structures (Lovett, 2009, 2001) and one side's victory over another (Posthuma et al., 2012).

In some situations, it is even helpers who have control over Open Gardens, instead of garden openers. In the narrative below, an opener called Janet explains how an urgent demand to recruit an additional helper arose and was satisfied by one of her helpers called Adelaide.

Janet: I had organised for Adelaide, my friend, and Blanche, the two names that you have. They were going to do teas and coffees. Now Adelaide hadn't done it before because I had another friend who used to do it. And she had stopped doing it. So Adelaide hadn't done it before. Blanche knew what she was doing. But Blanche at the last minute had to call off because her nana, her grandmother wasn't well. And so she couldn't come, which meant Adelaide was on her own. And she'd never done it before. So she didn't know what to do. Fortunately, she phoned her friend Dorothea who came along and helped.

As described in the extract, there were initially two friends of the openers who were supposed to serve refreshments. One of them, Blanche, had experience of doing this before and therefore knew how to help. However, she could not turn up because of her mother's health issue. Due to the urgent need of an alternative helper, Adelaide, another opener's friend, asked her own friend Dorothea to come and help them. Janet's Open Garden was thus temporarily under Adelaide's stewardship. The important point here is that garden openers confer, where necessary, part of their 'power to' orchestrate their own Open Gardens on helpers, and that garden openers' 'power to' deploy their helpers does not necessarily lead to the openers' 'power over' the helpers. Berger (2005) suggests the concept of 'power with' to refer to the act of empowerment as an alternative approach to 'power over' which refers to the traditional domination model. 'Power with' features, Berger adds, shared power and forms collaborative decision-making processes. In Scottish Open Gardens,

possessors of the actual control over the management of Open Gardens were not exclusively garden openers. As exemplified by Janet's narrative, some of the helpers I encountered during fieldwork also possessed operational 'power to' run Open Gardens. It is therefore inaccurate to describe the helpers as those who just obey orders given by garden openers. Their relationship should rather be characterised by the openers' shared 'power with' the helpers. Krüger (2012) explains that one's complete domination over others, for which the master-servant relationship is a metaphor, and its presentation in garden-related contexts are Victorian vestiges observed in classic literary accounts. The applicability of the concept of domination to contemporary Scottish Open Gardens must be greeted with scepticism because garden openers were not dominating helpers.

In this subsection, I argued along the lines of Hearn (2012) that the concept of domination does not entirely explain the social power relationships between garden openers and their helpers not least because it was unlikely that one party possessed absolute 'power over' another. Whilst garden openers played a central role in their own Open Gardens, they did not unreasonably exploit helpers to smoothly and successfully run the events. Leanna's narrative demonstrated that the garden openers rather persuade or request helpers to play roles in Open Gardens, and provide them with rewards, such as post-event meals, where necessary. In addition, Janet's comment illustrated that helpers can also have a certain degree of 'power to' control Open Gardens, and take the initiative on behalf of garden openers in the situation where the urgent necessity to recruit another helper arises. In short, garden openers were not definitively more powerful than helpers, and hence their power relationships could not be fully explained by a simplified powerful-powerless binary.

6.1.2. Complexities surrounding garden openers' authority and legitimacy

Hearn (2012) claims that in order to explain power operations that do not fall into the category of domination, it is crucial to consider the concepts of authority and legitimacy as alternative analytical tools that help us understand how power is manifested in studied phenomena. Authority is a valid and accepted form of power "to make commands and have them obeyed" (Hearn, 2012: 23), and there cannot be

authority without legitimation. The process of legitimation is therefore a precondition for authority, and, without this, power exercised over others may be recognised as domination. Domination often carries a negative connotation of one's manipulation of subordinate others to their own advantage which is often against the subordinates' will (Allen, 2010). Conversely, authority and legitimacy connote a justifiable power operation (Scott, 2006). These principles, however, do not holistically explain complexities surrounding authority and legitimacy. I therefore investigate below what turns power into authority and how garden openers' deployments of others and actions taken in specific contexts are legitimised.

Legitimacy is of fundamental importance to the qualitative differences of power, as Hearn (2012) explains that in a narrow sense, legitimacy pertains to the locus of authority. From Hearn's thinking, the implication is that the subject worthy of discussion is a boundary between being legitimate and illegitimate. The failure to legitimise power notably emerges in Open Gardens as security issues. Connell (2005) reported that the most common problem regarding the management of garden opening was damage to the gardens, followed by theft. In this research into Scottish Open Gardens, a few garden openers to whom I talked referred to security issues, such as intrusion (Appendix 60). What follows is from an interview that I conducted with Geraldine, who has opened her garden for 13 years. She once experienced an intrusion into her house while her garden was opened to the public.

Geraldine: There once was a man in this house. I came and I'd left that door, I keep the door shut. It's more that. It's more people doing things that they shouldn't really be doing. And this older man suddenly, I came into the house and he gave me a fright cause he came out of that room. And he just had wandered in. And that gave me a fright. It wasn't unpleasant but he just shouldn't have been there!

Geraldine kept the house shut, but a man wandered in and gave her a fright when he came out from one of her private rooms. The Chief Executive of SG clearly stated in an interview that visitors' entry to the openers' houses is not permitted. In the Garden Owners' Information Pack (SG, 2011), SG also clearly advises that houses must be

locked (Appendix 38). Intrusion into garden openers' houses can therefore be viewed as an illegitimate exercise of physical power by visitors.

Nevertheless, it would seem that garden openers do not possess sufficient 'power to' discipline such unwanted visitors. One of their countermeasures against such instances of illegitimate power is that signboards on which 'No entry' is written are available to prevent such issues. These signboards are provided by SG, delivered by volunteers and placed by garden openers around their own estates. Their effectiveness is rather dubious because, as observed in Geraldine's narrative, visitors' unauthorised entry into openers' houses has been reported. In order to analyse the reason why Geraldine could not prevent the visitor's unauthorised intrusion, it is useful to re-visit the geographical parameter of authority (see 3.3.3). Authority is legitimate in certain bounded contexts (Bulkeley, 2012). Based upon the general distinction between private power and public power, Hearn (2012) notes that households are domains where outside interference is supposed to be kept to a minimum. As Acharya, Myers and Rajan (2011) note in their research into the internal governance of firms, those who are in a superior position in a domestic sphere can take control over their subordinates inside the sphere or close stakeholders outside the sphere. Applying this principle to the relationship between garden openers and visitors, the openers' power is legitimate within its geographical or institutional parameters. In other words, the openers did not possess the authority to prevent the visitors' illegitimate intrusion because the latter was an outsider.

As shown above, it is relatively straightforward to understand that garden openers' power may fail to achieve legitimacy when it is exercised with the aim of controlling the action of visitors who are not involved in the production of Scottish Open Gardens. On the contrary, the legitimacy of social power that operates inside the co-production of Scottish Open Gardens can be much more complicated. On page 171, I recounted how Angela asked Bhagwanti, her ex-housekeeper, to manage the entrance administration although there was no longer an employment contract between them. The subject that is discussed here is the legitimacy of Angela's act. I was confused and unable to make an instant judgement because in the semi-structured interview

with Bhagwanti, she did not show any annoyance or unwillingness to assist Angela. Bhagwanti rather expressed the pleasure that she obtains from socialising with visitors at the entrance to Angela's garden. Bhagwanti remarked that she enjoys "the ambiance of garden environment" and likes to be with "like-minded people". Throughout the interview, I did not find any negativity or sense of compulsion in her words.

One possible interpretation of the relationship between Angela and Bhagwanti is that Bhagwanti accepted Angela's 'power over' her. As recounted in Chapter 3, one of the understandings of the Gramscian notion of hegemony is 'domination by consent' (Clegg, 2010). When one exercises 'power over' others, it does not necessarily result in confrontation and conflict. It may be that Bhagwanti had reached agreement on Angela's 'power over' her. Another possible interpretation, which further deepens the analysis of legitimacy in this context, is that Bhagwanti did not *feel* it to be illegitimate. It is worth reiterating here Fuchs' (2011) distinction between objective and subjective legitimacy. From an objective viewpoint, Angela's treatment of Bhagwanti may be illegitimate because there is no longer an employment contract that legally supports her exploitation of Bhagwanti. From a subjective viewpoint, Angela's 'power over' Bhagwanti may be legitimate because the latter did not perceive it to be illegitimate. The case of Angela's relationship with Bhagwanti therefore is demonstrative of some possible discrepancy between the objectivity and subjectivity of legitimacy.

In order to judge whether power exercised in a specific context is legitimate or not, it is necessary to explore people's subjective perceptions of the power and its exercise. For example, it is technically possible for garden openers to raise 40% of gross income for their own charitable bodies. In other words, garden openers cannot only be donators, but also beneficiaries. Indeed, Kentaro, who is a Japanese prospective garden opener with whom I conversed, planned to raise the money for an art trust that he runs. His comment, which I translated from Japanese into English, rationalised his thinking as follows.

Kentaro: In order to progress the project, we need a certain amount of money for the budget. For example... we have the collections. The most expensive ones are paintings, and we do not take out insurance for them. Compared to the paintings, other art works such as porcelain are much cheaper, and therefore the cost of insurance for them is not that much. But taking out insurance for more than 150 paintings is exceptionally expensive--particularly as some of them are highly acclaimed and worth six figures. You know what I mean? ... In addition, in order to be officially recognised as a trust, you need to be part of various official organisations. For instance, there is a trust called the Museum Gallery Scotland which inspects museums in the country. It's a national organisation and they... check museums or art galleries in the country. You have to pay annual membership fees to become a member of such bodies. The Museum Gallery of Scotland is relatively expensive. You have to pay about £130 to them. Let's say you have to pay such memberships for three organisations. It will cost you £390, right?

Kentaro rationalised the nomination of his own trust by emphasising the necessity to cover the cost of insurance that he takes out for the artwork he owns and of membership of the Museum Gallery of Scotland. His intention to raise money for his own trust is certainly one of the possible ways in which a charity legally operates, but one could accuse Kentaro of pursuing his own commercial interests. There have been a number of debates and controversies over the commercialisation and marketisation of charities (McKay, Moro, Teasdale and Clifford, 2011). Guo (2006) problematises this trend by reporting that some non-profit organisations that are supposed to contribute to social benefits are interested only in increasing their own commercial revenues. As explained in Chapter 3, Beetham (2013) presents two different meanings of legitimacy: legal validity and moral justifiability. Even if Kentaro donates 40% of gross income to his own trust, it is legal and does not violate the regulation of SG and Scottish charity rules. This may be, however, perceived by others, or even Kentaro himself, to be morally unjustifiable because the way he intended to run his own Open Garden sounds as if he commercialises it. Kentaro's 'power to' make a financial contribution to his own trust is indicative of the importance of moral justifiability as a criterion of legitimacy.

Beetham (2013) explains that legitimacy is strengthened where one's exercise of power is defined by both legal validity and moral justifiability. A demonstration of this can be found in the relationship between Pauwell, who has publicly opened his

castle garden for SG, and a professional qualified gardener that he employed. Pauwell asked the employed gardener to bake cakes to sell on public open days. The gardener was also told by Pauwell to sell the cakes to visitors on public open days. There was also a necessity to recruit somebody to mind the entrance administration, so the gardener asked her mother to help Pauwell's Open Garden. Even though these were extra duties irrelevant to the gardener's expertise, she did not express any complaint when I interviewed her. She rather found public open days pleasurable because they were a precious opportunity for her to exhibit the garden which is, to quote her own words, "a reflection of me". Following Beetham (2013), Pauwell's 'power over' the employed gardener thus achieved both legal validity and moral justifiability.

As this subsection has illustrated, authority and legitimacy are complex ideas that cannot be explained easily. One of the complexities surrounding authority and legitimacy is its geographical limitation. As Bulkeley (2012) explains, power is rightful and valid in certain bounded contexts. Garden visitors' illegitimate intrusion into openers' private houses was a demonstration of the co-producers' lack of sufficient authority over outsiders. Another complexity I discussed was the difference between objective and subjective legitimacy (Fuchs, 2011). The relationship between Angela and Bhagwanti exemplified that one's 'power over' another can feel 'right', 'moral, and 'justifiable'. As Beetham (2013) notes, legitimacy is an ambiguous concept that means both legal validity and moral justifiability. Even if one's behaviour does not violate laws or rules, it may be perceived by those over whom power is exercised, those who exercise the power or even the third party, to be morally unjustifiable. Whilst this section addressed only the issues of garden openers' social power and its subjective legitimacy, the other prominent actors in the production of Scottish Open Gardens are the volunteer organisers. In the next section, I investigate their social power, and attempt to further the understanding of objective and subjective legitimacy.

6.2. Social power of volunteer organisers: objective versus subjective legitimacy

This section investigates the power of volunteer organisers, by which I mean District Organisers and Area Organisers. The key analytical point is a discrepancy between what Fuchs (2011) coins objective and subjective legitimacy. Whilst objective legitimacy brings *prima facie* plausibility to one's power and its exercise, its subjective counterpart is concerned with emotional and personal judgement on legitimacy (Weinstock, 2011). As contexts in which the discrepancy between objective and subjective legitimacy is notable, I describe the relationships between volunteer organisers and garden openers, and the relationships between volunteer organisers and SG. The section concludes with the argument that the justifiability, rightfulness or acceptability of power enacting in the interpersonal relationships within the production of Scottish Open Gardens is largely determined by subjective legitimacy.

6.2.1. Power relationships between volunteer organisers and garden openers

This subsection is concerned with the ways in which volunteer organisers exercise their 'power over' garden openers. One of the important affairs in terms of the relationship between the volunteer organisers and garden openers is the inspection of gardens. It is a principal responsibility of District or Area Organisers to examine the quality of gardens owned by those who wish to open (Appendix 26). According to the Guidelines for District Organisers (SG, 2012a), District Organisers and Area Organisers are responsible for judging gardens' standards. They are commissioned by SG to allow or refuse garden owners to participate in Open Gardens. Below is the list of selection criteria that are articulated in the Guidelines for the District Organisers.

- Gardens may be of any size. If a garden is very small it is best to get some others nearby to open with it. Several small gardens can be open together.
- The garden must have some horticultural interest
- The garden must be tidy
- The garden owners must want to open for Scotland's Gardens
- Allotments should be considered
- Vegetable gardens are of great interest

- Snowdrops are very popular and properties with good snowdrops should be encouraged to open. For owners snowdrop time is good as weeds have not started!
- Bluebells are also very popular
- Garden centres/Nurseries provided they have a garden of a suitable standard (SG, 2012a: 3-4)

These criteria detail what volunteer organisers are expected to pay attention to when they inspect others' gardens. The Chief Executive of SG also mentioned in a semi-structured interview that "each garden has to be inspected every time by some of our team". Therefore, the organisers have a duty to exercise their 'power to' carefully examine the quality of gardens in accordance with the above criteria. Despite this basic principle and expected observance of the previously mentioned criteria for garden selection (Appendix 27), it is questionable whether the organisers' power is considered as authority because some of them lack fair understanding of what their remit and its proper use are.

The more I interviewed District and Area Organisers, the more sceptical I became about whether they accurately understood their mandate to inspect gardens. This was partly because some District and Area Organisers were completely ignorant about the selection criteria, and partly because it was common for some of the organisers with whom I conversed to refer to the length of time that visitors' interest would be expected to be maintained by an Open Garden. However, as shown in the aforementioned criteria, there is no reference to length of interest. The Chief Executive of SG also did not specify how long "some horticultural interest", which is the second criterion mentioned above, was supposed to be maintained. Moreover, many of the volunteer organisers that I have interviewed expressed different notions on the length of "some horticultural interest" (Appendix 29). I will extract the organisers' comments from three different interviews to illustrate the inconsistency in, or the lack of consensus on, the length of "some horticultural interest".

Martin: The attention or interest for... about 40 or 45 minutes. But you could of course have two gardens of 20 minutes each. If they are open, could be next door each other. So two very small ones. So collectively for one piece of money you are getting 40 minutes, but they happen to be in two different gardens. But it's... that sort of amount of time.

Sylvia: A garden as a stand-alone garden, which mean nobody else opens with that garden, which is a Sunday opening or by arrangement or weekday opening, should have 40 minutes horticultural interest.

Maureen: It's 10 minutes interest, isn't it? 20 minutes?

Nina: Yeah, 20 minutes for single gardens.

Maureen: It's 20 minutes of interest for a single garden when it opens alone.

As shown above, in each interview, the volunteer organisers expressed a different understanding in terms of the length of “some horticultural interest” (Appendix 29). Since it is possible to jointly open different gardens in the same neighbourhood, Martin, Maureen and Nina believed that a shorter length of interest is required for each garden in a group opening. Their understanding varies from 10 minutes to 45 minutes, although no suggestion is written in the Guidelines for the District Organisers (SG, 2012a). According to Scott (2014), as brought up in 3.3.3, institutions have different bases of legitimacy, depending upon their types. In what Scott (2014) coins ‘regulative institutions’, regularised and rule-defined behaviour is required, whereas in ‘cultural-cognitive institutions’, taken-for-grantedness, shared understanding or common beliefs determine the justifiability or rightfulness of behaviour. Scott further explains that whilst legitimacy is legally sanctioned in regulative institutions, the basis of legitimacy is comprehensible, recognisable and culturally supported in cultural-cognitive institutions, and can cause confusion for insiders. Employing Scott’s (2014) terminology, the garden selection operates in both ‘regulative’ and ‘cultural-cognitive’ ways. Despite the existence of the regulation and selection criteria that instruct District Organisers in the inspection of gardens, the volunteer organisers appeared to be somewhat guided by the uncertain rumours spread among themselves. They assumed that they could require prospective garden openers to maintain a certain length of horticultural interest for their visitors. There was therefore a discrepancy between the regulation and the un-written, but spoken, ‘minute rule’, and, ultimately, there were double standards in forming the judgement on the legitimacy of the ways in which volunteer organisers inspected gardens.

The aforementioned selection criteria may objectively support the legitimacy of District and Area Organisers' 'power to' inspect gardens. If this is the case, their 'power to' inspect gardens is regarded as authoritative because, as Hearn (2012) explains, the fundamental understanding of authority is legitimate power – a justifiable and acceptable form of one's control over, or influence upon, others. However, I have already noted in 5.3 that legitimacy is also defined subjectively (Fuchs, 2011). Even if the justifiability of one's power is objectively supported by existing regulations, it may *feel* unacceptable to those over whom the power is exercised, or even those who exercise power over others. Subjectivity is therefore another analytical point to examine with regard to authority and legitimacy. The extract quoted below is a dialogue between myself and a District Organiser called Joceline. In the dialogue, she expressed how she felt about her duty to judge whether a garden is up-to-standard.

Interviewer: As an organiser, have you ever said to someone, 'No, you can't open your garden'?

Joceline: No. That's my big fear. Tomorrow if I go and see this garden and it's awful, I don't know what I will do. (Laughs) It's such a terrible terrible thought. Usually, people (she knows) recommend and somebody I know well has recommended this garden I'm seeing tomorrow and I trust this garden opener to tell me that this is a good garden. There is actually another one who sent a message to say he'd like to open. And I'm told by everybody in the neighbourhood that it's a horrible little garden. So I've just said, "I'm very sorry but we have to have parking for 50 cars", or something like that. "I'm very sorry we can't open your garden". But yes, it is my big fear. My big fear is somebody with a horrible garden. Horrible small garden who wants to open.

A unique indication from Joceline's view is that the possessors of authority are not necessarily enamoured with their 'power to' inspect and judge the quality of gardens. Joceline initially answered that she has never refused anyone, but halfway through the dialogue she remembered an experience of giving a negative answer to somebody. Interestingly, when she refused, she did not mention to the prospective opener the garden's quality that was not up-to-scratch, but the lack of parking space available. In other words, she kept the real reason for the rejection secret, and strategically lied to the prospective opener. Joceline's comment reveals her perception that the exercise of her 'power over' garden openers whose gardens were not up-to-standard

may be felt by them to be unacceptable. This narrative suggests that Joceline fears that her power may fail to achieve, to follow Fuchs' (2011) terminology, subjective legitimacy. Wrong (2002) explains that authoritative figures sometimes make the enactment of their authority less obvious, as it is critical to the avoidance of a possible power confrontation. This view may apply to Joceline's way of exercising her 'power over' garden openers. In order to avoid potential conflicts with garden owners, it was not necessary for her to rationalise the rejection by honestly conveying the unsatisfactory quality of the garden. It was rather safer to refer to something that was less relevant to the garden owner's passion for horticulture (such as parking), instead of telling the owner an unpleasant truth. There was therefore a discrepancy between the real rationale behind the rejection and the reasoning she actually told the owner. More importantly, this discrepancy was a result of Joceline's avoidance of explicitly exercising her 'power over' garden openers.

Another possible, albeit analogous, interpretation of Joceline's reluctance to fully exercise her 'power over' garden openers is the lack of confidence in her own power. McCool and Khualo (2015) address this point in the context of tourism management, with the concept of 'power within'. 'Power within' refers to self-confidence, self-esteem or self-assurance (Nikkhah, Redzuan and Abu-Samah, 2012), and without such confidence in one's powerfulness his or her 'power to' is only potential (McCool and Khumalo, 2015). The possessor can build or enhance the confidence *within* domestic realms to which he or she belongs, as Cook states, "within organizations, individuals become more powerful when they grow in the subjective sense of feeling able to do things hitherto out of reach..." (Cook, 1997: 290). This certainly links to Fuchs' (2011) emphasis on subjective legitimacy. Joceline may have felt unconfident in her own 'power to' instruct garden openers because she knew that the garden was not hers, but someone else's dedicated creation in that person's private terrain. Thus, Joceline was uncertain whether her order to re-develop the garden was accepted by the garden opener.

Even if a volunteer organiser is hesitant or unconfident about fully exerting their 'power to' examine gardens, they have to be inspected otherwise complaints about

unsatisfactory garden quality may be received from visitors. A comment made by a different organiser called Jean, who has been in charge of small gardens in a village, demonstrates a possible scenario where such poor-quality gardens are allowed to open.

Jean: I've only once and that was when... I think it was about two years after I'd been asked to join the committee of the previous Area Organiser before Camille. And head office had had a complaint about the garden in one of the villages, the village gardens. And I was asked to go with the... yes, I didn't enjoy that. Go with the Area Organiser. And they had to tell that their gardens weren't up-to-standard. And before they opened again, they would have to do something about it.

It is apparent from Jean's words that she was not happy to pass on the complaint from visitors about the garden's unsatisfactory quality and the local committee's verdict to its opener. Unlike Joceline's case, Jean did not conceal the truth – the unsatisfactory quality of the garden – from the garden owner, and with honesty informed the owner of the necessity to improve the garden. Hospitality and tourism management studies have revealed that some of those who have managerial responsibilities are unwilling to exercise their authority over other associates (Williams, DeMicco and Shafer, 2001). This reluctance to claim and use power is a matter of concern, as it partly defines the quality of leadership in leisure and tourism settings (Gallant and Hutchinson, 2016). In Open Gardens too, volunteer organisers are expected to take the initiative and to give prospective or existing garden openers clear instructions although narratives introduced above indicate that some of them hesitated to do so because of a risk of confrontation. There were another two organisers who were in the same local committee, and more clearly showed the same hesitancy as that of Jean. In a semi-structured interview, one of them, Maureen, strenuously denied the necessity to inspect prospective Open Gardens, saying “No! No! I'm not going to inspect... ‘inspection’, I think, is too strong a word. It's used in England. I've heard it's used for National Gardens Scheme in England that the local committee come and inspect their gardens”. Nina, who was another organiser present in the same interview, followed up Maureen's view as below.

Nina: First of all, it's really rare. I've not seen it where somebody offers their garden unless they are a business where they offer to open. So first of all, it's always us that goes and says, 'Please will you open your garden?'. So that already ensures that we know that it's a good garden. So we are not really in a position where we're going, 'Your garden is rubbish. You can't open'. Because people don't come forward and say, 'We would like to open'. And secondly, I think there is a thing around charging. So when you are charging people to go in, you have to be confident that there is enough stuff to see of sufficient interest to make that two pounds or four pounds feel like a worthwhile investment.

Nina's comment indicates that even though gardens need to be good enough to satisfy visitors, she and other volunteer organisers in her district rarely judged the quality of gardens. Instead, they found gardens, which they thought to be worth opening, and requested their owners to open. Some of the other volunteer organisers that I interviewed also showed a similar view. Thus, whilst District and Area Organisers are empowered by SG to inspect the gardens, they often make lenient judgements on the garden quality (Appendix 28), due to the need to guarantee a certain number of Open Gardens in a locality. This contradicts one of the findings of research conducted by Kay et al. (2008), who reported that in garden openings in Victoria, Australia, some garden selectors are elitist and strictly judged the quality of gardens. One of the theoretical perspectives that may be adopted to explain Nina's request for garden owners to open is what Wrong (2002) termed 'authority by inducement'. As explained in 3.3.3, it is a sort of power exercise that gains consent or agreement of those over whom power is exercised by persuasion. Nina and her colleagues certainly had the 'power to' judge the quality of gardens and select gardens of an acceptable standard. This does not necessarily mean, however, that they established superiority over prospective garden openers; rather, they identified owners of manicured gardens and persuaded them to open for SG. Nina's approach lies in contrast to Jean's who had to order a garden opener whose garden did not live up to the expectation to redevelop it. Unlike Jean who retrospectively talked about the unpleasant feeling of meeting the garden opener, Nina did not express any anxiety over her persuasive methods. This sharp difference in their emotional accounts suggests that volunteer organisers are particularly reluctant to exercise their 'power over' garden openers when there is a necessity to tell them unfavourable results.

Interestingly, when it comes to the degree to which Open Gardens under SG are examined, the volunteer organisers and garden openers with whom I conversed commonly explained their views in comparison with the NGS that runs Open Gardens in England and Wales (Appendix 30). In Scotland, the number of Open Gardens is 10 times smaller than the Open Gardens under the NGS (NGS, 2014; SG, 2014). Amongst volunteer organisers I interviewed, those who were in charge of sparsely populated regions typically shared the view that in order to guarantee a certain number of Open Gardens, over-strict judgements needed to be avoided. As already reported in the section on data verification (see 4.8), an example of this view is observed in a comment made by a District Organiser who was in charge of a region in the Scottish Borders.

Serena: I am not the strictest on choosing gardens, mainly because we live in such an under populated area and not many people come forward to offer to open up. In England, it is totally different. There are people queuing to open and quite often refused.

In addition, most of the volunteer organisers and garden openers to whom I talked commonly inferred this opinion from the television programme on the subject that the judgement is much stricter in Open Gardens under the NGS. This is well demonstrated by a dialogue between myself and a garden opener called Geraldine.

Interviewer: You don't know so much about (selection) criteria.

Geraldine: I mean people generally apply to be considered. It's certainly much more competitive in England. There was a television programme last year, I think, about the NGS. And the organisers were coming and telling that they had to do this or do that to their garden to get in the book. And personally, I would not have liked that at all. And I just would've said, 'oh well, I'm not going to be in it then' because otherwise how can it be you, it's not your choice? If someone's telling you put up the pergola here, if you do this here. That's not... no, I couldn't be like that. I'm a much more independent spirit than that.

Based on the television programme, Geraldine found the judgement of SG much more lenient than that of the NGS. Geraldine's view was that under the NGS, it is acceptable to give prospective garden openers orders to make changes to their

gardens. Despite Geraldine's alienation from the way in which the NGS inspects gardens, it is unclear whether the NGS really is stricter than SG because one of the garden openers in the North East of England, with whom I conversed during the first phase of fieldwork, mentioned that the NGS's inspection of her garden was quite easy. The subject I intend to explore here is an impact of Geraldine's belief that the NGS is more severe than SG upon acceptability of SG volunteer organisers' 'power to' inspect gardens. According to Bulkeley (2012), in order for authority that operates inside a community or institution to be legitimised, it needs to be publicly recognised. Unlike SG, the NGS's practice is frequently broadcast on television. This appears to enable their scrutiny to be publicly recognisable, and, consequently, legitimised. Cashore (2002) suggests seeking external audiences' opinions on legitimacy of power operating in a domestic sphere, and emphasises the importance of consent granted by outsiders. It was not only Geraldine who conveyed the perception that the NGS has more exacting standards than SG does. Other garden openers and volunteer organisers with whom I conversed also inferred from television programmes that SG is lenient compared to the NGS. It would seem that television programmes shaped their view that the strict judgement is taken for granted in Open Gardens under NGS, but is not in Scotland. Therefore, the acceptability of volunteer organisers' 'power to' inspect gardens depends partially upon public awareness.

In Open Gardens under the auspices of SG, once a garden fulfils the required standard, or a volunteer organiser manages to obtain a garden owner's agreement to open, the next step is to select a day or days to open. This is also a process in which the volunteer organisers have to work in a close co-operation with garden openers. The arrangement of open days can be a thorny issue because the traditional high season of garden visitors is June, and everyone wants to open their gardens when the highest possible number of visitors can be expected. A District Organiser called Camille explained how she manages this:

Camille: They (garden openers) don't see the bigger picture. Maybe they just see that they really want to open on that weekend in June. And sometimes you have to persuade them. 'Actually somebody's already booked that Sunday. And

I'm sorry, I can't give it to you. And it wouldn't be a good idea to have four gardens open on one day. Because you will all suffer. So maybe you need to plan ahead more. You have to give me your date now for next year'. Sometimes also I think with the District Organiser role, you need to tell garden openers, 'Actually, maybe have a year off'. Maybe it's not good idea to be open every year... because I think there is always the novelty factor. If it's a new garden open, they would do very well. And then next year they do very well because a lot of people will have missed it. And even next year. But if open every single year on the same Sunday, then you are going to be disappointed with the income. And sometimes it's quite difficult managing that disappointment. You know, to point out to them that, 'Actually, instead of opening in June, why don't you open in April? Then you get a different section of the population. But also people will come because they want to see what the garden looks like at a different time of year.

Camille sometimes persuaded garden openers to open on a day different from the one requested, or to have a year off as she thought that having a garden open every year could cause it to lose its popularity. As explained above, authority is exercised, where appropriate, by inducement in order not to prompt confrontational reactions of others (Wrong, 2002). Seen this way, Camille's inducement are indicative of an effort not to cause conflict between herself and garden openers in the district of which she was in charge. Again, Fuchs' (2011) thinking on subjective legitimacy is worthy of note here because the way in which Camille tried to evade the risk of confrontation was based on her own reflection, instead of garden openers'.

Camille's narrative addresses an important question: Whose perceptions of power and its legitimacy matter? This question can be addressed effectively by recent governance studies' emphasis on the distinction between input legitimacy and output legitimacy (Karlsson-Vinkhuyzen, 2016). Input legitimacy denotes 'governance by the people' and inclusion of all stakeholders, whereas output legitimacy is 'governance for the people' and is concerned with how governance is perceived by stakeholders (Krause and Nielsen, 2014). Employing these concepts, Camille's way of arranging open days probably achieved input legitimacy because she carefully interacted with garden openers. She sometimes rejected days requested by openers, but rationally explained the reason for the rejection to them by mentioning the need to avoid simultaneous public openings and the importance of the novelty factor. Such communications with openers is suggestive of her inclusive attitude towards the

arrangement of open days. However, it is debatable whether Camille achieved output legitimacy because her perspective only reflects her own view, and does not inform us of how the garden openers in her district perceived the way in which Camille exercised her 'power over' them. The central point in this discussion is that Camille perceived that her 'power over' may be felt by garden openers to be unacceptable. This is worthy of mention because Camille's narrative highlights the necessity to examine how power exercisers perceive their own 'power over' others.

As already suggested by the narratives analysed above, District and Area Organisers with whom I conversed were careful when exercising their 'power over' garden openers, as they did not want to generate unnecessary conflict. Nonetheless, one of the District Organisers reported a confrontation between herself and a garden opener in her district. In an interview with the organiser, I unintentionally gathered information on a local garden opener's rejection of the date that the organiser suggested. According to the organiser, the opener is the wealthiest person in the locality and lives in a large country house. Since the wealthy man's Open Garden attracts a number of visitors and results in much financial profits every year, the District Organiser unwillingly accepted a date that the opener preferred although there was another Open Garden on the same day. There is a marked contrast between this case and other narratives that I analysed above. In this case, the District Organiser failed to persuade the wealthy garden owner to open other days, and acquiesced in the clash between two different Open Gardens. This is therefore an illustration of failure of what Wrong coins (2002) 'authority by inducement' that is to justify one's authority by persuading those over whom the authority is exercised. One of the conceptual tools that may elucidate this case is Nye's (2004) 'soft power'. As explained in 3.3.3, this is a way to exercise 'power over' others by providing those over whom power is exercised with what they want, which eventually enables the power exerciser to achieve his or her intended outcome. Applying 'soft power' to the above case, the District Organiser's compromise evaded not only potential conflicts between herself and the affluent garden opener, but also the worst case scenario that the wealthy garden opener might not agree to open, and consequently no profit would be gained from his garden. This case demonstrates that for volunteer

organisers, dealing with garden openers can involve a highly sensitive process of negotiation and acquiescence.

This subsection revealed that the legitimacy of volunteer organisers' power over garden openers is not solely defined by written regulations, but also, as Fuchs (2011) emphasises, subjectivity and emotional judgements on its justifiability or acceptability. Whilst the selection of gardens and the arrangement of public open days are both the organisers' responsibilities, they were reluctant to, or unconfident about, fully exercising their 'power to' inspect gardens and arrange seasonal schedules of Open Gardens in their own districts. This was because volunteer organisers perceived that their power may not be felt by garden openers to be acceptable, rightful or justifiable. Indeed, a few garden openers with whom I conducted interviews implied that they would feel volunteer organisers' power over the opener to be unacceptable if the organisers' inspection of gardens was overly strict. The narrative presented above therefore illustrated both how volunteer organisers perceived their own 'power over' garden openers, and how garden openers perceived the organisers' power over the openers. In the next section, I orientate the focus towards the relationships between volunteer organisers and SG, and further discuss the discrepancy between objective and subjective legitimacy.

6.2.2. Power relationships between volunteer organisers and SG

The salient analytical point regarding the relationship between volunteer organisers and garden openers was a discrepancy between what Fuchs (2011) termed objective and subjective legitimacy. The same discrepancy existed in the power relationship between volunteer organisers and SG. As a specific context through which their nuanced power relationships are examined, I describe the distribution of marketing materials. According to the Guidelines for District Organisers (SG, 2012a), distributing marketing materials including posters, flyers, calendars, signage, road signs and banners is one of the District Organisers' principal responsibilities. These materials are of course for the purpose of increasing the profile of Open Gardens (Appendix 39). The organisers have to deliver the requested materials to garden openers and other appropriate places such as local information signboards. This duty is commissioned by the head office of SG. The following excerpt from a District

Organiser called Nina expresses her perception of SG's way of commissioning the volunteer organisers to perform this task.

Nina: Sometimes I get annoyed with Head Office because we get lots of leaflets, and lots of posters and phone calls, "Could you just go and put up these posters? And can you just go and put up ...?" And actually, no, I can't. I'm self-employed. I've got two kids. I've got a huge garden. I do other charitable stuff. And no, I can't. So I think there could be volunteer fatigue. So I think it's just very interesting if your research helps a better process to get more people to the gardens where a bigger role is taken by... central office. And there's less reliant, or different marketing strategy is used. So it's because it's really true that the numbers attending are dwindling because it's people who are looking out for the gardens to be open who come. It is not... Joe Public, at all. And it would be great, wouldn't it?

Nina very explicitly showed annoyance regarding SG's request to distribute the materials, and apparently highlighted the organisation's overwhelming reliance on the volunteer organisers. Importantly, Nina implicitly asked me to raise this issue in my research. According to Berger (2005), leaking, which is defined as "the delivery of sensitive information to key outside parties" (20), is the most typical form of unsanctioned resistance. Nina's complaint to me may be seen as her resistance against the organisation taking advantage of the organisers' voluntary contribution. Her view itself substantiates the undermined status of volunteer organisers, and a power conflict between her and the head office.

Nina's resistant attitude towards SG questions whether the way in which the organisation commissioned her to distribute marketing materials was legitimate. It is worth re-visiting the difference between objectivity and subjectivity of legitimacy (Fuchs, 2011). Sanctioning actions taken in a specific context in accordance with law, rule or regulation is not necessarily identical to *feeling* it to be acceptable or justifiable. Even though objective legitimacy brings *prima facie* plausibility and makes the judgement on legitimacy very clear-cut (Weinstock, 2011), no acceptance might be gained from those over whom power is exercised. Applying these insights into the ambiguity of legitimacy to Nina's narrative, it was objectively legitimate that the head office commissioned Nina to distribute the marketing materials because it is one of the organisers' responsibilities articulated in the official guideline. However,

the head office of SG failed to acquire subjective legitimacy and Nina's consent because the way in which the organisation asked her was not felt by her to be rightful, acceptable or justifiable, although the distribution of marketing materials is mentioned in the Guidelines for District Organisers (SG, 2012a) as one of the principal responsibilities of the organisers. Nina's antipathy against SG's oppression therefore demonstrates a sharp contrast between objective and subjective legitimacy.

One possible cause of such a discrepancy between objective and subjective legitimacy may be SG's institutional status as a charitable body and the organisers' statuses as volunteers. According to Acharya et al. (2011), successful internal governance of private firms stems from a working process that as stakeholders the subordinate managers can force the CEOs to act in a more public-spirited and far-sighted way. Unlike the managers in business settings, the District or Area Organisers are by definition unpaid workers (Appendix 14). If they gained monetary compensation for their devotion to SG, they might have had a little more 'power to' express their own opinions on the management of Open Gardens to the organisation, and 'power to' perform acts of resistance. Stout (2013) explains that unlike some political or economic contexts where constitutional or discretionary judgements on legitimacy are definitive, some sectors that entail citizens' voluntary engagements, such as charities or trusts, internalise highly complicated process of legitimation of power, and are likely to face an issue of empowerment. Whilst volunteer organisers are stewards who are in charge of the management of Open Gardens, they are not salaried employees. District and Area Organisers' statuses as volunteers make it difficult for them to acquire sufficient 'power to' publicly voice their concern that SG overloads them with duties.

Paradoxically, it was also questionable whether SG had sufficient 'power to' order the volunteer organisers. This is indicated in a dialogue between me and Paton who is the Chief Executive of SG.

Paton: You know, we have to be a charity. It's business-like these days. We have to be very professional.

Interviewer: I was assuming charity is more like... I was assuming charity is different from business.

Paton: Not very, no. I don't think it is very. The main difference is that, you know, you can't tell a volunteer to do something. And if he doesn't do it, you give them a rocket, because you have to persuade them to something. And in business you can tell them to do something. It has to be done. It's not so easy in a charity.

Paton realised that in theory he cannot order the volunteers to perform tasks. Again, important themes that emerge in Paton's narrative are SG's status as a charitable organisation and organisers' statuses as volunteers. What enables a hierarchically superior figure to take control over subordinates in the business world might be salaries given to the subordinates as a monetary reward. As noted earlier, the provision of reward is a persuasive way to exercise power over others and achieve goals in co-operation with those who were given the reward (Nye, 2004; Wrong, 2002). Without monetary compensation to volunteers, it may be difficult for SG to let the volunteers follow the Guidelines for the District Organisers (SG, 2012a). Indeed, some of my interviewees mentioned uncooperative volunteers who remained in local committees without discharging their duties. This is exemplified by the following passage from an Area Organiser called Martin who talked about his colleagues in the local committee.

Martin: So she is the main organiser in [his area]. And... there was another couple involved. And the wife died, and the husband wants to stay on the (local) committee, but actually doesn't do anything. So [District Organiser] just brought three people on in last couple of months.

This extract illustrates the uncooperativeness of a volunteer in Martin's local committee. According to Paton, who is the Chief Executive of SG, one of his main responsibilities is to check the profiles of new volunteers recommended by existing volunteers, and to examine their industriousness. (Appendix 36). He remarked, however, that it is sometimes difficult to get cooperative volunteers. Another paid worker of the organisation commented that some of the volunteers remain in their local teams just for prestige, as exemplified by the comment below made by a member of the paid staff called Fenella.

Fenella: I think there's a lot of prestige about the District Organiser post - being seen to be involved in a charity. And I think sometimes we need to be careful of that because we have a few, not too many, a few people who just like being seen as a District Organiser and don't want to do the work. They just, 'Oh well, yes, you know I'm involved with this charity'. But they don't actually put in the groundwork for it. So managing volunteers is quite tricky because obviously they have to get something from it otherwise they won't do it. There has to be some feeling of good vibes for them.

This narrative confirms a finding of one of the previous studies on garden openings: some volunteers in the Victoria region of the Australian Open Garden Scheme sought to boost their own careers by giving their time to a local horticultural society (Kay et al., 2008). An important analytical point that emerges in Fenella's comment is the moral justifiability that Beetham (2013) identifies as a principal element of legitimacy. Fenella commented that there are volunteer organisers whose motivation for participating in local committees is to seek prestige. It is debatable whether such a status-seeking is morally unjustifiable, but being inactive and the nonfulfillment of duties must be. This is because local committees and SG have expectations regarding volunteers' performances, yet the District Organisers Fenella mentioned did not meet them. Fenella's comment hence indicates that the industriousness of volunteers is not guaranteed. Potter (2011) presents the nihilistic view that those who are interested in elitism participate in benevolent activities to signal their own status, and describes this as 'pseudo-charitable' mentality. In other words, the driving force behind the volunteers is not only altruism, but also self-centredness (Bussell and Forbes, 2002). Moreover, the narratives of Paton, Martin and Fenella are suggestive of SG's limited capacity to discipline uncooperative and inactive volunteer organisers whose real interests do not correspond to the fundamental objective of SG, that is, fundraising for charity. Just as volunteer organisers did not have sufficient 'power to' claim that SG heavily relies on them, the organisation also did not possess enough 'power to' disapprove some organisers of being unhelpful.

In this subsection, I continued to discuss the discrepancy between objective and subjective legitimacy (Fuchs, 2011), by exploring the relationship between volunteer organisers and SG. The importance of the subjective aspect of legitimacy was emphasised when SG commissioned volunteer organisers to distribute marketing

materials. There was an official document that articulated that the distribution of marketing materials is one of the significant duties for which the organisers are responsible, but Nina's antipathy against the way in which the organisation deployed herself demonstrated that objective legitimacy is not the sole criterion to consider. Due to the subtleties that existed in the power relationship between volunteer organisers and SG, I focused on the organisers' statuses as volunteers and the organisation's status as a charitable body. The absence of monetary compensation and of boss-subordinate relationships were both considered as factors that made volunteers and SG struggle to have sufficient 'power to' disapprove each other of socially undesirable acts.

In summary, this section unveiled two major findings. First, District and Area Organisers paid close attention to how they used, or did not fully exert, their power when the necessity to communicate and cooperate with garden openers arose. This included complex processes of persuasion, negotiation and acquiescence. Second, the subjective aspect of legitimacy was crucial to the interpersonal relationships between volunteer organisers and garden openers, and between volunteer organisers and SG. What is rightful, acceptable or justifiable is not solely defined by existing regulations, but also by subjective perceptions of parties concerned. Throughout this section, I have construed subjective legitimacy as an important criterion for the justifiability of power possessed and exercised by volunteer organisers or SG. Objectivity is therefore not the sole definer of legitimacy, and power enactments within volunteer organisers' relationships with garden openers and SG were contexts to which subjective legitimacy was particularly of importance.

6.3. Chapter summary

This chapter discussed two major subjects. First, I explored the social power of garden openers. The narratives discussed in 6.1.1 showed the limitations of the concept of domination in the social power relationships between garden openers and their helpers. The concept of domination refers to a complete power imbalance between multiple agents (Lovett, 2009, 2001) and one side's absolute victory over the other (Posthuma, et al., 2012). However, the relationships between openers and their helpers were so nuanced that a simplified powerful-powerless binary was

inadequate to explain them. The openers usually requested, rather than ordered, their helpers to manage plant sales, catering services or entrance administrations. Furthermore, Open Gardens were occasionally partly under the stewardship of helpers, instead of garden openers. For the purposes of the analysis of their quasi-egalitarian relationships, the concept of domination is limited in its capacity to further our understanding of their subtle social power relationships, and hence interpersonal relationships between co-producers were more appropriately and deeply analysed through the analytical lenses of authority and legitimacy.

Following Hearn's (2012) recommendation, this chapter employed authority and legitimacy as alternative and more appropriate analytical tools to explain power operations within the production of Scottish Open Gardens. Authority is a valid and accepted form of power "to make commands and have them obeyed" (Hearn, 2012: 23), and legitimacy is the precondition for authority. This principle, however, does not comprehensively explain the complex ideas of authority and legitimacy, and hence I carefully discussed what turns power into authority and how power is legitimised. Consequently, I highlighted two important determiners of authority and legitimacy. One was, as Bulkeley (2012) emphasises, the geographical parameter, which was notable where the co-producers lacked sufficient 'power to' prevent visitors' illegitimate intrusion. Another was, following Fuchs (2011), the discrepancy between objective and subjective legitimacy. One's 'power over' others may be felt by those over whom the power is exercised to be morally acceptable or justifiable. This was best exemplified by a friendship between a garden opener called Angela and her helper called Bhagwanti, who did not express any negativity in helping Angela for no remuneration. This was a demonstration of the importance of the co-producers' perceptions of power used in their interpersonal relationships.

The second subject with which this chapter was concerned was the social power of volunteer organisers, and was, inspired by Fuchs (2011), to deepen the understanding of the discrepancy between objective and subjective legitimacy. By examining the selection of gardens and the arrangement of open days, I featured the contrast between official documents that objectively supported the organisers' 'power over'

garden openers, and their reluctance to fully exercise the power. The organisers' hesitancy about fully using their 'power over' the openers was a result of the organisers' awareness of a risk that garden openers may feel their power to be unacceptable. On the contrary, the detailed description of the way in which SG commissioned a volunteer organiser to distribute marketing materials informed us that SG's 'power over' the organisers may be perceived by the latter to be unjustifiable, although the distribution of marketing materials is one of organisers' principal responsibilities that is articulated in an official document. I inferred from these narratives that the judgement of legitimacy of the co-producers' power is formed by not only written regulations, but also their own perceptions of the justifiability of their power. Therefore, subjective legitimacy was featured as a crucial determiner of the legitimacy of power enacting in interpersonal relationships in the production of Scottish Open Gardens.

The above-summarised two subjects discussed in this chapter offer one important implication: in Scottish Open Gardens, there is not a singularly definitive powerful figure whose power is unconditionally perceived to be justifiable and rightfully exercised over other parties concerned no matter when and where it takes place. The concept of domination was inadequate to explain their moderate and variable power relationships. The rightfulness, justifiability or acceptability of their power depends on contexts, and hence are situationally defined. The defining characteristic of social power operating amongst the co-producers of Scottish Open Gardens is therefore the absence of an absolute authoritative agent.

Chapter 7: Show-offs and moral justifiability

7.1. Introduction

In this chapter, I investigate garden openers' perspectives on showing off their gardens. Whilst some existing studies on the history of gardens and present garden openings suggest the importance of status display or signalling as a theme that emerges in garden-related contexts, data presented below suggest that garden openers do not openly express the intention to show off their gardens and horticultural achievements. I draw a contrast between garden openers' desire to display their gardens and their attempt not to be regarded as arrogant or boastful. Following Beetham's (2013) suggestion, moral justifiability is considered as a crucial determiner of the legitimacy of showing horticultural achievements. The concept of moral justifiability helps us understand why garden openers avoid ostentatiously showing their gardens, and tacitly signal their horticultural achievements instead. I conclude that showing off is perceived by both garden openers and others to be socially undesirable.

7.2. Rise of my personal interest in show-offs

Before presenting empirical data from my fieldwork, I will briefly explain how my curiosity surrounding showing gardens developed. My interest in showing off originates from, first and foremost, Veblen's (1889) idea of conspicuous consumption. By this term, he explained the leisure class' ostentatious display of socio-economic achievements through the non-productive consumption of time and money. Whilst the sustainability of conspicuous consumption and Veblenian understandings of the leisure classes have been contested (Galbraith, 1958; Murphy, 2016; Rojek, 2000), this thinking was the inspirational starting point of this research (see 1.2).

Another context from which my interest in showing off was strengthened was historical studies on gardens of the powerful. Martin et al.'s (1993) research into the conspicuous display of an extraordinary garden of a gentry family in mid-Suffolk, Charlesworth's (1986) work on status rivalry between two 18th century landscape gardens in Yorkshire, and other relevant studies that I introduced in 2.2.6 all discussed the cultural practice of showing off. In contemporary contexts, too,

gardens are thought of as status symbols (Bhatti and Church, 2001; Hitchings, 2003). Ryan and Bates (1995), who researched a garden festival in New Zealand, reported that an item ‘To show others what can be achieved’ significantly rose from pre-opening surveys to post-opening surveys (65). It has therefore been empirically suggested that showing off emerges as an important theme in British garden openings.

My belief that showing off is worth investigating was further strengthened after I began to consider power as the principal analytical lens through which this current research into Scottish Open Gardens is examined. The theoretical inspiration that connected showing off to power lay in the discourses on power and Bourdieu’s understanding of capital. As explained in 3.2.4, unlike Hunter and Mills’ ‘behaviourist’ approach that focuses solely upon observable power enactments (Hearn, 2012), Lukes’ (2005) idea of ‘the three-dimensional view’ of power pays attention to hidden and implicit power operations. Bourdieu’s (2006, 1990, 1986) thinking on capital more clearly explains how we can detect such kinds of veiled power that underlie our social behaviours. The concept of capital necessarily has an economic connotation, but Bourdieu (1986) explains that economic statuses are ‘transubstantiated’ by symbolic capital. Symbolic capital manifests one’s prestige or honour, and includes different sub-categories such as social capital, which refers to one’s social network, or cultural capital, which reflects one’s realised form of valuable knowledge in a given field (Bourdieu, 1986; Moore, 2012). Economic and symbolic capitals are inextricably intertwined, as Bourdieu (2006) states, “Interest, in the restricted sense it is given in economic theory, cannot be produced without producing its negative counterpart, disinterestedness” (105). Bourdieu’s concept of capital therefore implicates that power can be transposed from its economic form to socio-cultural forms, and can have different kinds of faces or manifestations. Bourdieu’s thinking on capital inspired me to think that Open Gardens can be symbolic manifestations of garden owners’ economic power.

7.3. Show-offs in Scottish Open Gardens

As shown above, the more I read relevant literature, the more interested in showing off I became. The preliminary data analysis also suggested that showing off is

worthy of deeper investigation and may be something that garden openers consider as a matter of course. This was because garden openers become to some extent confident in their own gardens by the time they start opening, which is well exemplified in the narrative of Geraldine:

Geraldine: And obviously, I've looked at other people's gardens over the years, and before we opened ourselves, as have friends obviously. And that was why they said to me, 'You should think about opening'. And then there were two girls who were working for Dobbies, at Dobbies Garden Centre. And I used to go out there and ask for plants, and they got to know me... And I got to know them, and they came one day. They said 'Oh, I want to see where you are putting all these plants'. And they came and had a look and said, 'Oh, you should open your garden!'. And that gave me the confidence really because, you know, they were, sort of, garden people and had nice gardens themselves. So that really pushed me to do it.

The important analytical point regarding Geraldine's extract is the transition from the lack of confidence (Appendix 50) to the possession of confidence (Appendix 47) in her garden quality. Geraldine recounted how two different kinds of people suggested opening to her. One group was her friends who also garden. In keeping with the fact that she did not reach a complete decision to start opening at this point, she was probably still not confident enough in her garden. Another group of people was the two women working for a commercial gardening centre. Geraldine interpreted the latter as a stronger driving force behind her entry into the world of Open Garden because they worked in the garden centre. Like Geraldine, other garden openers to whom I talked also commonly mentioned that they are pleased and satisfied with what they have achieved in their gardens. I do not argue that garden openers are all very self-assured and fearless about their gardens' quality, but I infer from my data that garden openers think of their gardens as something that has reached an acceptable or reputable standard.

Contrary to my enthusiasm about learning about the literature surrounding show-offs and to empirical data that substantiated garden openers' confidence in their garden quality, there was only one garden opener who could be described as a show-off. The following extract from a fieldnote illustrates how a garden opener called Leanna proudly informed me about her horticultural achievements.

Leanna: By the way! There's only two gardens in Scotland which are private gardens, which are part of the partner garden scheme. Right?

Interviewer: So this is one of them.

Leanna: This is one of them! I'll get the book. I'll get the book. I'll show you...

-She left the kitchen where we were talking and quickly came back with a leaflet about RHS (Royal Horticultural Society) Partner Gardens. –

Leanna: Right, so... this is the RHS partner gardens for this year. Right?

-She showed me a map illustrating where the partnership gardens are located. And she explained that there are only two private gardens which are registered for RHS partner gardens in Scotland. Actually, [A different partnership garden in Scotland] is also private and she acknowledged it but arguably emphasised that "At the time I was one of two". The rest are gardens owned by National Trust for Scotland or commercial. She called the garden names one by one and returned to her garden. It was a bit persistent.-

Leanna: Okay! So, you can take this away if you want!

I still remember vividly the moment Leanna started searching for the leaflet of RHS partner garden. According to its website (accessed on 18th June 2016), there are a mere 176 partner gardens in the UK, which indicates that it is prestigious to be on the list of RHS partner gardens. After the above extract, Leanna also talked about her appearance in a BBC programme called Beechgrove Garden, and told me excitedly about a big banner that she had hung on the wall of her house when her garden was featured in the television programme. She also showed me a medal she was awarded with by the Caledonian Horticultural Society. It is useful to re-visit Bourdieu's (2006, 1990, 1986) thinking about symbolic capital. Symbolic capital may symbolise its possessor's economic achievements, but its salient feature is to manifest the possessor's social or cultural achievements (Moore, 2012; Sturzaker and Shucksmith, 2011). Leanna therefore simply showed off the pamphlet of RHS partnership garden and a medal of a horticultural award, and talked about the appearance in Beechgrove Garden, as symbols of her horticultural achievements (Appendix 40).

Leanna's narrative suggests questioning why other garden openers did not ostentatiously show off their horticultural achievements. Other garden openers with whom I interacted had also won horticultural prizes such as a Gold Medal from the

Chelsea Flower Show, or were featured in the media as owners of reputable gardens. Whilst they did not explicitly speak about such awards or appearances in the media, in their gardens there were different kinds of signals of their horticultural achievements, such as pictures of royal visit or a visit from Carol Klein, who is a well-known gardening expert and the co-presenter of a BBC programme called *Gardener's World*. Such signals were indicative of garden openers' perceived hesitancy about frankly expressing their interest in showing their gardens off (Appendix 46). This can be observed in the following comment made by a helper, Bhagwanti, who used to live in a garden opener's house as a residential housekeeper.

Bhagwanti: Yes, I mean, British culture is not to be quite open about that (show-offs). And I would say [the opener] is very like that. But I think when you ask 'What's the main motivation?', I think that's the main motivation but they wouldn't display that to others. I think the main motivation is to be proud of it, and show and tell other people what they have achieved. But yeah, like you said, they are not very vocal in that. But it's like, 'Well, my garden can speak for itself'.

From the helper's perspective, Bhagwanti acknowledged that the main motivation for opening the garden to the public is pride in horticultural achievement. Personality studies have highlighted the nexus between pride and status. Pride is a key concept within the mechanism that motivates status seeking, signalling and display (Tracy, Shariff and Cheng, 2010). A non-verbal display of one's pride is an automatic and perceived message of high status (Tracy and Matsumoto, 2008; Tracy and Robins, 2008). It has been suggested that there is a positive correlation between pride and power: the more powerful one is, the more proud he or she is (Anderson and Berdahl, 2002). These research outcomes suggest that display of gardens to others can for garden openers be a manifestation of horticultural achievements and their 'power to' create reputable gardens.

In the *Garden Owners' Information Pack*, SG advises, "It is YOUR garden and you have every right to be proud of what you have achieved with it" (SG, 2011: 1). Despite this encouragement, Bhagwanti also remarked that the openers do not explicitly express such a pride. Her view implies that boastfulness is seen by visitors or even garden openers as, to follow Beetham's (2013) terminology, 'morally

unjustifiable'. Recent studies on economic culture and behavioural sciences suggest that some people conceal their real interest in showing off because such an ostentatious display of achievements may signal the displayer's vulgarity. Murphy (2016) states that today's elites rather regard conspicuous signalling of status as quixotic and blatant attempts to gain others' attention, which may in turn prompt others to conclude that these 'elites' are actually of rather low status. Similarly, Hareli and Weiner (2000) note that arrogance is a factor that reduces admiration from others, whereas modesty increases it. Modesty is therefore considered as a socially desirable strategy of self-presentation and impression management (Blickle, Diekmann, Schneider, Kalthöfer and Summer, 2012). The degree to which modesty is valued varies according to cultural norms (Mast, Frauendorfer and Popovic, 2011), and Bhagwanti indicated that it is particularly important in British society. The importance of modesty is well exemplified by an extract from an interview with a garden opener called Janet.

Janet: I don't think that I go out saying, 'Look at my garden! It's better than everybody else's! I try to downplay it because I don't want people coming and saying, 'What is she going on about? You know, it's only another garden, what's so special?' I do want people to come and admire it. I don't want to feel as if I've put it on show and I was wrong to put it on show. I want people to really appreciate that it was worth seeing.

-Later on, I asked how she judged the quality of her garden-

Janet: I wouldn't have put it on show if I didn't think it really was worth seeing.

This extract suggests, as an important analytical point, Janet's hesitancy regarding showing off. This reflects her ambivalence and perception that an ostentatious display of horticultural achievements may be seen by others as, to use Beetham's (2013) terminology, morally unjustifiable. What Janet tried not to do is to overly flaunt the quality of her garden. Janet's use of the term 'downplay' implies she actually found her garden up to standard. Indeed, Janet stated at the end of the passage that her garden is "really worth seeing". Gregg, Hart, Sedikides and Kumashiro (2008) note several defining features of 'modesty': humble, not boastful, not arrogant, attention-avoiding, and importantly, likable. Humility is a socially desirable attribute just as boastfulness is not (Hilbig, Heydasch and Zettler 2014).

Janet perhaps believed that her garden was of good quality, but her modesty stopped her from talking about it honestly and openly. Even though she said that she did not want the act of opening to be interpreted as “putting on a show”, she later described it as such. On the one hand, she thought that exhibitionism is not socially acceptable, while on the other, she seemed unable to refrain from displaying certain self-assurance. All in all, Janet’s comment is demonstrative of her tacit hope to show off her garden in the guise of modesty.

7.4. Chapter summary

This section investigated garden openers’ varying intentions to show off their gardens and its moral justifiability, which Beetham (2013) has suggested is one of the crucial aspects of legitimacy. The narratives discussed above indicated that garden openers are, to a varying degree, proud of, and confident in, their gardens. Whilst some garden openers’ intention to show their horticultural achievements was tacitly presented in their narratives, they hesitated to express this desire. This hesitancy was suggestive of their perception that the ostentatious display of horticultural achievements was arrogant. Janet’s view illustrated that most of the garden openers try to conceal such boastful behaviour, and prefer to be seen as modest, humble or likable. Moreover, Bhagwanti’s view on show-offs indicated that it is not only garden openers who are aware of the concealment of the desire to display and signal their horticultural achievements. The section found that both garden openers and other co-producers perceived showing off to be culturally sensitive and socially unacceptable.

This section focused upon the co-producers’ mentality towards showing off. One possible different analytical pathway to explain the discrepancy between garden openers’ reluctance to be regarded as show-offs and their real interest in showing off may be Goffman’s (1963) famous work on *Stigma*. This analytical framework was, nonetheless, not employed in this thesis because those who are stigmatised are usually those who possess little power compared to those who stigmatise (Link and Phelan, 2014, 2013), and my data showed that garden openers were rather possessors of a certain degree of both physical and social power. A more detailed rationale behind this decision will be given in 8.7 where I will suggest contextualising garden

openers' hesitancy about showing off with Goffman's insights as a possible orientation for further research.

Chapter 8: Conclusion

8.1. Introduction

The concluding remarks in this chapter are divided into seven sections. I first restate the research objectives, methodology, theoretical framework and major findings. After encapsulating these, answers to the research question are given. I then suggest a contribution to knowledge, highlight a limitation of this research, and suggest implications for practice and research. The thesis concludes with autobiographical reflections which include my own learning experiences and emotional accounts of difficulties that I encountered in the research process.

8.2. Recapitulation of research objective, methods and major findings

This research aimed to carefully describe how power operates in the co-production of Open Gardens under the auspices of SG and how those who co-produce the Open Gardens differ in the perception of the use of their power. Qualitative data were generated from 39 participant observations in Open Gardens and 41 semi-structured interviews with garden openers, helpers, volunteers and salaried workers of SG. The collected data were analysed by means of domain analysis which categorised themes emerging according to their attributes. The categorised themes were more precisely and rigorously understood by creating codes that consisted of label, definition, description, indicator, example and exception. In order to deepen the analysis and interpretation of power operating in the production of Scottish Open Gardens, Hearn's (2012) power conceptualisation was used as a principal theoretical framework.

One of the major findings was the inextricable entanglement of non-human elements with the human co-production of Scottish Open Gardens. Data generated from fieldwork showed that the quality of gardens is partly determined by weather conditions or natural inhabitants such as birds or foxes. Contrary to existing works that identify human domination over nature as one of the historical meanings of garden (Janick, 2014; Jellicoe, Jellicoe, Goode and Lancaster, 1991; Riley, 1990; Turner, 2005), perspectives of some garden openers and employed gardeners showed that human beings are not necessarily more powerful than nature. It was also demonstrated that the number of visitors was dependent in part on non-humans'

possession or lack of sufficient ‘power to’ encourage visitors. Food, such as cakes and teas, was identified as a significant possessor of ‘power to’ encourage visitors. Whereas, on the contrary, the power of medals or trophies that symbolised garden openers’ reputation of achievements in the horticultural world appeared to have its limits. All in all, the success of Scottish Open Gardens was partly dependent upon non-human factors. It is not my intention to describe non-human elements in an anthropomorphic manner, but they should be considered as a potential source of ‘power to’ motivate visitors to gardens open to the public. Ultimately, my stance became one that challenged the conventional premise that human-intentionality alone defines ‘agency’ in social sciences because the field data suggested several cases in which non-human factors influenced, whether intentionally or unintentionally, the production of Scottish Open Gardens.

Another important finding was understanding and reporting the limitations regarding the concept of domination as an analytical tool to explain the nuanced interpersonal relationships of co-producers. This was most notable in the relationship between garden openers and their helpers. Garden openers asked their friends to perform tasks required for the smooth running of Open Gardens. Garden openers instructed such helpers, but the openers’ reliance on the helpers indicated that the openers did not have absolute ‘power over’ the helpers. Whilst one’s complete domination over others, for which the master-servant relationship is a metaphor, can be observed in classic literary contexts that are relevant to gardens (Krüger’ 2012), the power relationship between garden openers and their helpers in contemporary Scottish Open Gardens was much more subtle, and approached something almost egalitarian.

This research also deeply investigated complexities surrounding authority and legitimacy. What was particularly important was subjectivity as a determiner of legitimacy (Fuchs, 2011). Narratives of some volunteer organisers showed their hesitancy about fully exercising their ‘power to’ inspect gardens. This was because they worried how overly strict and unsympathetic judgements on the quality of certain gardens might prompt unpleasant reactions from their garden owners. Data also illustrated the sensitivity of the arrangement of public open days. When there

was a possibility of coincidence that several gardens in the same area could end up opening on the same day, some of the volunteer organisers made the enactment of their power as moderate as possible so that they could avoid conflicts between themselves and garden openers. What Wrong (2002) termed ‘authority by inducement’, which is to gain co-operation of those over whom power is exercised by persuasion, helps to understand volunteer organisers’ nuanced ways of exercising their ‘power over’ garden openers. A similar sensitivity also existed in the relationship between volunteer organisers and SG. For example, the data unveiled an opposition to the way in which SG deployed volunteer organisers. Whilst the data also showed some volunteers’ inactivity, idleness and pursuance of their own status enhancement or career development, SG was not powerful enough to discipline such volunteers’ ‘pseudo-charitable’ (Potter, 2011) or self-centred (Bussell and Forbes, 2002) attitudes towards their engagement with Scottish Open Gardens.

The most salient point regarding social power operating amongst the co-producers was the lack of correspondence between objective and subjective legitimacy. The legitimacy of the co-producers’ power was in many cases supported by existing regulations or guidelines. The Guidelines for District Organisers (SG, 2012a), for example, articulates that the inspection and selection of gardens is one of their responsibilities. Similarly, the Garden Owners’ Information Pack (SG, 2011) encourages them to be proud of their gardens. Such regulation and guidelines therefore objectively empowered producers and justified their use of power and behaviours. Nevertheless, emotional accounts of hesitancy about, or disagreement with, their exercising of power showed that objectivity is not the sole criterion of the legitimacy of power operating in the production of Scottish Open Gardens. Therefore, the quintessential theme that emerged and characterised social power enacting amongst the co-producers was the significance of subjective legitimacy.

The importance of subjectivity of legitimacy was further highlighted when describing some garden openers’ perception of the display of horticultural achievements. Data demonstrated that they refrained from openly expressing their intention to show off their gardens because of the perceived concern that others

might feel such an ostentatious display of horticultural achievements to be socially unacceptable. This hesitancy about frankly expressing the intention to show off gardens was explained by what Beetham (2013) coins ‘moral justifiability’. This is one of the principal meanings of legitimacy, and refers to forming the judgement on legitimacy according to the degree to which one’s power and its exercise are socially desirable. Arrogance, boastfulness and attention-seeking are not socially desirable (Gregg, Hart, Sedikides and Kumashiro, 2008; Hilbig, Heydasch and Zettler, 2014). The act of showing off gardens, which symbolise the owners’ horticultural achievements, was therefore perceived by garden openers to be socially unacceptable.

8.3. Answer to the research question

The preceding discussions all served to answer the research question that was articulated in 2.5, and which is reiterated below.

How does power, which differs in meaning according to human perception, operate in the production of Scottish Open Gardens?

In order to answer this research question, I highlighted two characteristics of the production of Scottish Open Gardens. First, there is no definitive powerful agent amongst the co-producers of Scottish Open Gardens. This claim needs to be explained in two different levels. In terms of the relation between humans and non-humans, the locus of power often shifts between them. Both nature and materiality can be more powerful than humans where such non-human elements are involved in the creation of gardens, generation of publicity and other tasks required for the production of Open Gardens. In terms of the interpersonal relationship, there is no definitively dominant party amongst the co-producers. Their relationships are highly nuanced so that persuasion, compromise or the possession of expertise are crucial strategies for them to justify their power and to maintain their interpersonal relationships. The thesis reported different cases in which one kind of producer had ‘power over’ others, but they were episodic, varied and too moderate to be construed as one’s absolute domination over others.

As the second characteristic of the production of Scottish Open Gardens, legitimacy of the co-producers' power or behaviours is determined by numerous different factors. As Bulkeley (2012) emphasises by the concept of 'private authority', there is a geographical parameter of authority. The co-producers' lack of sufficient 'power to prevent visitors' illegitimate intrusion into openers' houses was an indication that their power is only valid within the internal world of Open Garden production. There is also, as Scott's (2014) distinction between 'regulative institutes' and 'cultural-cognitive institutes' indicates, an institutional factor. Legitimacy is not solely defined by regulations and rules. Volunteers' lack of a proper understanding of the criteria of garden inspection, which are clearly mentioned in official documents, demonstrated that taken-for-granted beliefs could also support legitimacy. The inspection of gardens illustrated that the legitimacy of the power used by the co-producers is defined in both 'regulative' and 'cultural-cognitive' manners. This relates well to the importance of individual human perception as a factor that determines legitimacy. Discussions of the binary logic between objectivity versus subjectivity (Fuchs, 2011) showed that the legitimacy of power used by the co-producers depends on how they perceive it.

For Weber (1947), the basis of legitimacy is belief. He acknowledges that legality is a determiner of legitimacy, but explains that legitimacy is ascribed to someone by traditional or even emotional beliefs that his or her power is legal. What is believed and perceived to be legitimate is therefore the very essential condition for legitimacy (Beetham, 2013). Following this view, I argue that the perceptions of justifiability, rightfulness and acceptability were most essential for the co-producers' judgement on legitimacy of power operating within themselves. To answer my research question in a most succinct manner, I conclude that power very tacitly operates in the background of the production of Scottish Open Gardens in ways that its legitimacy is largely defined by the co-producer's perception of justifiability, rightfulness and acceptability of their own power.

8.4. Contributions to knowledge

I already remarked in 1.6 that this thesis offers contextual, methodological and theoretical contributions to knowledge. By contextual contribution, I mean that the

thesis has focused on the production of Scottish Open Gardens that was an unexplored field compared to garden visiting. The methodological contribution of this research is the use of qualitative approaches that were not employed by the previous studies on garden visiting and openings (see 4.6). Participant observations and semi-structured interviews shed light on garden openers' and other associates' emotional accounts of the ways in which they co-produce Scottish Open Gardens. In addition, supplementary data were collected by the documentary analysis. By consulting the minutes of QNI and other official documents, the research re-interpreted the historical development of Open Gardens under the NGS and SG, and presented more accurate historical accounts of SG by revealing false information on the year in which the 60-40 split in money raised for charity was initiated (see 2.3.4). In terms of theoretical contribution, the thesis analysed how power, which was a subject absent in the field of garden opening and visiting, was operating within the co-production of Scottish Open Gardens, and employed Hearn's (2012) power framework as a principal theoretical framework for the analysis. The thesis is, in short, original in terms of the studied context, employed methods and theoretical orientation.

As an extension of the theoretical contribution mentioned above, I put forward below a new power framework that is particularly suitable for analysing power used within the production of Open Gardens, and importantly, within other leisure and tourism events. Throughout this thesis, the combination of 'power to' and 'power over' succinctly described who (or what) has what power and over whom (or what) the power is exercised. Whilst this is the combination that has been widely employed by social scientists to analyse power enactments, some researchers have cast doubt about its sustainability and interpretations. Pansardi (2012) questions the conventional assumption that 'power over' is a conception of social relationships between multiple agents, and claims that 'power to' also refers to social relationships. Similarly, Haugaard (2012) shows scepticism about the long-lasting understanding that 'power over' refers to a zero-sum game in which A completely wins and B loses, and argues that 'power over' can rather be a positive-sum situation of which both sides can take advantage. This opinion is analogous to the claim that I made in 5.3,

that interpersonal relationships between the co-producers can be too nuanced to be described as one's absolute domination over others.

There is also room for debate over the chronological sequence of power. As noted in 3.3.2, Hearn (2012) explains that 'power over' is a manifestation of 'power to'. It is not clear, however, how long 'power over' keeps manifesting 'power to'. In situations where A and B prevails over each other at the same time, one's 'power over' another is not permanent, but episodic (Haugaard, 2012). As argued above, Scottish Open Gardens are partly characterised by the shifting locus of power between human and non-human agents, or between different human agents, and dominant agents vary according to context. I therefore challenge the view that domination is not episodic, and think that a span in which one's 'power over' others manifests his or her 'power to' is limited. One possible demonstration of the variability of power structures is, as reported in Chapter 5, human-nature relations. Even if one dedicates himself or herself for a long time to controlling the growth of flowers and manages to make them bloom at an intended time, temporal extreme weather conditions, such as thunderstorms, may totally destroy the flowers. Human domination over nature can therefore be highly fluid, and does not permanently manifest human 'power to' control nature.

For the reasons discussed above, the sustainability of the two analytical tools, that is, 'power to' and 'power over', is contestable. To this combination, McCool and Khumalo (2015) add 'power with' and 'power within' in order to more accurately explain power operations in contexts of tourism management. Indeed, in 6.1, I employed 'power with' to analyse a helper being empowered by a garden opener to recruit another helper. In 6.2.1, 'power within' was also used to examine volunteer organisers' lack of confidence in their 'power to' inspect gardens and 'power over' prospective or existing garden openers.

Nevertheless, I do not think that 'power with' and 'power within' are able to fully explain tacit power enactments in the management of leisure and tourism events. Like the production of Scottish Open Gardens, different leisure and tourism pursuits

internalise power as an implicit but influential factor that lurks in the background of such pursuits (Coles and Church, 2007). One potential analytical tool that is more adequate for the analysis of the lurking of power is ‘power behind’. This has not been employed by researchers of leisure and tourism studies, but its importance and usability have already been indicated. For example, Peaslee (2010) studied media power behind the emerging trend of visits to movie location sites constructed during the filming of the trilogy of *Lord of the Rings*. This study implicates the usability of ‘power behind’ to analyse the mechanism and causality of leisure and tourism phenomena.

As Lukes (2005) emphasises with the three-dimensional view on power, it is misleading to solely pay attention to explicit and observable power operations. Power implicitly underlies different social fields including leisure and tourism pursuits, and determines affairs and events that are easily observable. Underlying forces or factors, whether human beings or not, control social phenomena from behind the scenes. The concept of ‘power behind’ has the potential to shed light upon implicit power operating in the background of social and cultural settings under investigation, and needs to be conceptualised more rigorously in future research.

8.5. Limitations of the research

Whilst my study has been primarily concerned with the co-producers of Scottish Open Gardens, I should stress that the current thesis has offered very limited descriptions of treasurers and trustees. Retrospectively speaking, there were several factors that made it difficult to investigate treasurers and trustees. One of them was the limited responsibility of treasurers. Unlike District and Area Organisers, the treasurer’s responsibility is limited to that of accountant. Data generated from interviews with treasurers did not show any clear difference in the way in which they recorded money received from garden openers and pass the record on to the head office. The data did therefore not reveal wide diversity of their perceptions of their responsibility. In terms of the reason for the limited descriptions of treasurers, it was difficult to approach them. Whilst the trustees with whom I conversed told me that they have regular meetings, it was unrealistic for me to attend them because the meetings are private. Contrary to the nature of public open days where many

strangers are present, trustees were a closed community. For these reasons, the ways in which they manage the finances of SG have remained unclear.

My account of the co-producers and their power is therefore almost limited to garden openers, helpers, the staff of SG and volunteer organisers, which perhaps prompted me to describe Scottish Open Gardens as the world in which subjectivity or moral justifiability significantly determine legitimacy. If the focus had been treasurers and trustees whose main responsibility is the observance of Scottish charity laws, then what Beetham (2013) coins 'legal validity' may have been identified as a defining characteristic of their judgement on the legitimacy of their own power. Consequently, the team of treasurers and trustees might have purely been what Scott (2014) terms a 'regulative institute' in which legitimacy is clearly defined by laws and regulations. If this is the case, my emphasis on what Fuchs (2011) coins subjective legitimacy does not apply to the power of treasurers and trustees. Therefore, my findings should not be read as insights into the ways in which treasurers and trustees perceive their own 'power to' manage the finances of Scottish Open Gardens.

8.6. Implications for practice

The thesis offers two major implications for practitioners of Open Gardens under the auspices of SG: clarification of empowered producers and clarification of the ways in which their power is legitimised. As shown above, there was not one absolute powerful figure amongst the co-producers of Scottish Open Gardens. In order to run the Open Gardens smoothly and successfully, however, I believe that the co-producers should have a clear idea of who needs to be empowered in any given context. In terms of the arrangement of open days, for example, volunteer organisers may need to use their initiative and to have sufficient 'power to' decide when each garden in their own districts are opened to the public. I am not suggesting that a specific kind of producer should perform their tasks independently of other kinds of producers. What I problematise is the fact that the kind of producers who are supposed to be empowered did not fully use their capacity because other kinds of producers, or even the empowered producers themselves, did not understand who possessed the power to take certain actions. Perceived power forms the basis of one's leadership and confidence in deploying followers (Murray and Chua, 2015). From

perspective of the followers, a clearly defined power structure is important because the sense of dependence upon superiors imbues the structure with legitimacy (van der Toorn, Feinberg, Jost, Kay, Tyler, Willer and Wilmuth, 2014). It may be unnecessary in Scottish Open Gardens for one kind of producers to be superior to others in a certain hierarchical structure. However, by ensuring that appropriate producers are empowered when performing certain tasks, Scottish Open Gardens are produced smoother.

It is also important to clarify the ways in which co-producers' power becomes legitimised. In particular, data presented in 6.3 showed vagueness of the legitimacy of volunteer organisers' power. Some of the organisers expressed misgivings of their own power or unwelcome response to others' power. This illustrated that the existence of rules or regulation that objectively support one's power is not the sole criterion of legitimacy, and that subjectivity of legitimacy is of crucial importance to the ways in which volunteer organisers' exercise power. My data were therefore evidences of the very complex process of legitimising power of volunteer organisers. There is no guarantee, as a matter of course, that one's behaviour or set of behaviours achieves legitimacy where the ways of legitimising them are indeterminate (Stout, 2013). In order for the co-producers to avoid confusion over how to turn the organisers' power into authority, I make two suggestions regarding practical ways to satisfy both objective and subjective criteria of legitimacy.

One of the possible ways to legitimise volunteer organisers' power is to establish electoral procedures for selecting them. Stout (2013) explains that under constitutional regimes, the legitimacy of government officials is achieved and supported by electing them as representatives. The Chief Executive of SG mentioned in a semi-structured interview that the volunteer organisers are nominated through word-of-mouth. If volunteer organisers' are appointed through an electoral procedure, then their 'power to' inspect gardens, arrange seasonal schedules and perform other tasks required for the smooth running of Open Gardens can be legitimised more easily and certainly.

Another possible way to legitimise the power of volunteer organisers is to elect District or Area Organisers on the basis of their expertise in horticulture. Even though District and Area Organisers are responsible for inspecting the quality of gardens, it is questionable that garden openers perceive District and Area Organisers to be horticultural experts because openers are not involved in the selection of volunteers, and also because information on volunteer organisers' horticultural backgrounds is not available in the guidebook and website of SG. Wrong (2002) identifies 'competent authority' as a form of legitimate power possessed and exercised by experts. Experts' judgements are a legitimate determiner of one's power (Swedberg and Agevall's, 2005) and expert knowledge is a source for claiming legitimacy (Karlsson-Vinkhuyzen, 2016). Foucault's (1980) concept of discourse also supports this notion that the possession of knowledge and expertise in a specific field enables its possessor to speak of 'the truth'. If garden openers are able to elect District and Area Organisers whose horticultural expertise is proven, the elected organisers may acquire what Wrong (2002) coins 'competent authority' and sufficient 'power to' manage garden openers.

As reported earlier, the production of Scottish Open Gardens does not include any clearly defined power structures. However, it is necessary for the co-producers to have clear ideas of who needs to be empowered when performing specific tasks, and of how their power needs to be legitimised and turned into authority. The two suggested ways of legitimising power of the volunteer organisers, that is, nomination of volunteer organisers through an electoral procedure and the appointment of horticultural experts as the organisers, may not perfectly support the justifiability of their power. Arguably, there is no guarantee that one's behaviour or set of behaviours achieves legitimacy where its meanings are multiple or ambiguous (Stout, 2013). The process of understanding legitimacy is therefore 'justice as seeking' (Farmer, 2006). The application of these methods will help both volunteer organisers and other kinds of producers to seek the justifiability, rightfulness and acceptability of the organisers' power operating within the coproduction of Scottish Open Gardens.

8.7. Implications for research

As noted at the end of Chapter 7, I suggested analysing garden openers' reluctance to openly express their interest in showing off their garden through the analytical lens of Goffman's (1963) Stigma. By the term 'stigma', Goffman is referring to instances when a person's specific attributes, which are possibly perceived by others to be abnormal, are concealed, minimised or disclosed (Scott, 2007). Showing-off gardens and ostentatious displays of horticultural achievements can be seen as socially undesirable, and hence others may (mis)apply stereotypes regarding arrogance or boastfulness to garden openers who would like to show their gardens.

Of course, Goffman's concept of stigma may have limitations. In particular, stigma may have limited applicability where it is employed to explain power relationships between people. Stigma is produced in asymmetrical power relationships (Link and Phelan, 2001), and the stigmatised typically possess little power compared to the stigmatisers (Link and Phelan, 2014, 2013). Impoverishment is, for example, typically stigmatised and seen as shameful in a British capitalist society (Sutton, Pemberton, Fahmy and Tamiya, 2014). Similarly, low cultural capital, engagement with low-brow cultural pursuits, and the lack of specialised skills and knowledge are likely to be stigmatised (Coskuner-Balli and Thompson, 2013). Stigma therefore connotes the inability to make intended results happen or the possession of insufficient economic, social and cultural power. For this reason, I decided not to employ the stigma framework in Chapter 7, where I discussed showing-off because it was questionable whether such a powerless connotation is appropriately applicable to garden openers. Seen this way, stigma may not be the most ideal analytical tool to explain the discrepancy between garden openers' modest attitudes towards their horticultural achievements and their real desire to show off their gardens. The above notwithstanding, the applicability of stigma to this subject, especially in relation to power, is worth examining in future research.

Another of Goffman's theoretical framework that was not employed in this thesis, but which has rich potential for further interpreting the data is *The presentation of self in everyday life* (1959). Dramaturgy is a term that is commonly used in theatre,

but is adapted by Goffman as a sociological perspective that illuminates interactions amongst people and the ways in which they engage in impression management (Scott and Marshall, 2009). For him there are actors and audiences in society, just as in a theatre, where social actors play different roles in their everyday lives (Collet and Childs, 2009). Goffman (1959) defines these social life ‘performances’ as “all the activity of an individual which occurs during a period marked by his continuous presence before a particular set of observers and which has some influence on the observers” (32).

One concept that may be particularly useful to explain garden openers’ tacit interest in displaying their gardens is ‘region’ that is defined as “any place that is bounded to some degree by barriers to perception” (Goffman, 1959: 109). As with the difference between frontstage and backstage in the theatre, social life can also be categorised into ‘front regions’ and ‘back regions’ (Bruce and Yearley, 2006). In comparison with front regions where actors perform in front of audiences, back regions are expected to be “a place, relative to a given performance, where the impression fostered by the performance is knowingly contradicted as a matter of course” (Goffman, 1959: 114). Moreover, in back region there are no intrusions from audiences (Goffman, 1959). I reported garden openers’ implicit desire to show off which was, however, at odds with their public persona. Such a discrepancy could be further explained by the differences between front and back regions. Goffman’s dramaturgical perspective therefore has the potential to interrogate how garden openers’ humbleness camouflages their real intention to show off, and his stigma framework may help us understand why they intend to prudently disguise their true character and wish.

8.8. Concluding comments: Autobiographical reflection

As concluding comments, I would like to describe autobiographical reflections on my own learning experiences throughout the research process and on my emotional accounts of difficulties that I encountered. Undertaking this research enabled me to learn different research skills that textbooks could not teach. In the literature review, for example, I checked original works cited in other works, and sometimes found several research papers or books in which direct quotations are not accurate or

original works that were misrepresented without using direct quotation marks. Encountering such inaccurate references in other research caused some anxiety, but helped me develop a cautious attitude towards citations. I asked myself how accurate my citations were and how much I could add my own interpretations to the original works. A body of literature on the meaning and history of gardens that I had read before beginning data generation shaped and specified my interest in Open Gardens. However, I felt it contradictory to the inductive principle of the present research because it was not straightforward to pay attention to themes that were not discussed in the literature but which were emerging over fieldwork. Even though I had tried to make the methodology of the present research perfectly defensible, I gradually began to feel that it may be unrealistic to expect methodologies of social scientific research to be completely logical. These experiences not only disciplined me to follow expected academic conventions, but also taught me that what underpins research methodologies may not consist of black-and-white issues, and that there may, at times, be grey areas.

In terms of the practical procedures of fieldwork, the most challenging task was to deal with a limited travel budget. In order to visit as many gardens as possible, train tickets were booked as early as possible to purchase cheaper tickets. When I went to collect data, several Open Gardens in the same neighbourhood were often visited on the same day. Travel costs were occasionally reduced when my participants kindly picked me up or dropped me off at train stations. Through the experience of working within a limited research budget, I learnt how essential it is to plan detailed fieldwork schedules beforehand, how to make each item of expenditure on travel cost-effective, and how indispensable participants' co-operation to social research is. Another difficulty with regard to methodology was to determine how best to go about sampling, data collection and data analysis before actually doing them. Even though there was a very rough plan of how to perform them, some of the descriptions, explanations and rationalisations of my methodology were in fact post-hoc decision making. I am certain that I read more papers and books about methodology after the completion of fieldwork, than I did before the initiation of fieldwork. Of course, there was a plan, but it had many aspects that did not work in practice. For example,

in the countryside, it often took much longer than Google Maps suggested to get to gardens on foot. There were also situations where roads I planned to walk down did not exist or did not have pedestrian pathways. Such unexpectedness caused delays in arrival at gardens. Not only technologies, but human memory was also often perceived to be unreliable. Some of my respondents forgot the appointments I had made to interview them. Contradictory to the importance of detailed work schedules, I also learnt that a plan is just a plan, and how things will unfold cannot be predicted until a start is made.

Finally, the turning point in the present research was undoubtedly the initiation of analysing my findings through the theoretical lens of power, which was totally absent from my mind at the outset. Power has traditionally been discussed and theorised in political contexts. From a non-British perspective, the subject of power seemed to be inherently and exclusively tied to the British class system in which the old feudal regime still partially remains. As Benn (2006) puts it, “We still have a House of Lords... If you scratch the surface, class in Britain is based on the old idea: it’s the landlords and serfs, and power and authority comes from above” (115). Because of my assumption that the nature of power is very different from my research subject, I first felt as if the outlook for the outcome of my research suddenly turned vague. Even though there was the prospect that the subject of power will deepen our understanding of Scottish Open Gardens, the contextualisation of the theoretical framework with my findings was in a sense a pursuance of uncertain and unexplained connections between power and Scottish Open Gardens. Since I began to analyse Scottish Open Gardens through the analytical lens of power, this thesis has been repeatedly restructured. It was challenging and painful because it felt as if I was breaking away from the original plan. It also felt scary and risky to spend time and energy understanding and applying power theories because of the uncertainty over the degree to which it relates to Scottish Open Gardens. I was also overwhelmed by a wide diversity of discourses and debates on power. I had read uncountable works on power every day, but the fount of power knowledge never dried out, and persistently offered me discussions.

As Cowie (2011) stresses, the broad subject of power is characterised by its plurality – whilst some researchers cannot resist the temptation of focusing on a singular definition of power, it incorporates widely differing meanings. Discourses on power are hence broadly diverse, and debates never end. Consequently, the more I read, the more I felt confused. However, this experience of being trapped in the ‘jungle of power’ gradually made me realise the day-to-day development of my knowledge and theoretical thinking. I owe this sprout of self-efficacy to previous theorists of power. Ultimately, the uphill struggle to examine Scottish Open Gardens through the analytical lens of power must help me, in the coming stages of my academic career, investigate how power underlies the production of a wide variety of leisure and tourism pursuits.

References

- Abercrombie, N. (2004). *Sociology: Short introductions*. Cambridge, Polity Press.
- Abercrombie, N., S. Hill and B. S. Turner. (1984). *Dictionary of sociology*. London, Penguin Books.
- Acharya, V. V., S. C. Myers. and R. G. Rajan. (2011). The internal governance of firms. *The Journal of Finance*, 66(3): 689-720.
- Acton, L. (2011). Allotment Gardens: A Reflection of History, Heritage, Community and Self. *Papers from the Institute of Archaeology*, 21: 46-58.
- Adshead, L. E. (2012). *Gardening across the life course: A qualitative study of the meaning of everyday gardening and its links with well-being*. PhD thesis, King's College London.
- Aida, A. (2002). *Research on the Origin and Development of Open Garden in Britain and Japan*. PhD thesis, Tokyo University of Agriculture.
- Aitchison, C. C. (2003). *Gender and leisure: Social and cultural perspectives*. Abingdon, Routledge.
- Akkerman, A. (2002). Altruism and Egoism: The Garden and the Citadel. *The Structurist*, 41(42): 65-72.
- Alberti, L. B. (1946). *I primi tre libri della famiglia*. Florence, Sansoni.
- Aldridge, J., J. Medina. and R. Ralphs. (2010). The problem of proliferation: guidelines for improving the security of qualitative data in a digital age. *Research Ethics Review*, 6(1): 3-9.
- Allen, A. (2010). Recognizing domination: recognition and power in Honneth's critical theory. *Journal of Power*, 3(1): 21-32.
- Alvesson, M. and K. Sköldbberg. (2009). *Reflexive methodology: New vistas for qualitative research*. London, SAGE Publications.
- Amherst, A. (2013). *A History of Gardening in England*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Anderson, C. and J. L. Berdahl. (2002). The experience of power: examining the effects of power on approach and inhibition tendencies. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 83(6): 1362-1377.
- Anderson, C., O. P. John. and D. Keltner. (2012). The personal sense of power. *Journal of personality*, 80(2): 313-344.
- Andrews, T. (2012). What is Social Constructionism? *Grounded Theory Review: An International Journal*, 11(1): 39-46.
- Arcangeli, A. (2003). *Recreation in the Renaissance*. Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Aristotle (1995). *The Politics*, E. Barker. (trans.). Oxford, Oxford University Press.

- Armstrong, A. (1988). *Farmworkers: A social and economic history 1770-1980*. London, Batsford.
- Atkinson, P. and A. Coffey. (2011). Analysing documentary realities. In D. Silverman (Ed.) *Qualitative research*. London, SAGE Publications: 77-93.
- Augspach, E. A. (2004). *The Garden as Woman's Space in Twelfth and Thirteenth Century Literature*. Lewiston, Edwin Mellen Press.
- Avery, G. S., Jr. (1957). Botanic Gardens - What Role Today? An "Operation Bootstraps" Opportunity for Botanists. *American Journal of Botany*, 44(3): 268-271.
- Bacon, F. (1985). *The Essays*. London, Penguin Books.
- Barron, L. (2009). Ontology. In V. Jupp. (Ed.) *The SAGE Dictionary of Social Research Methods*. London, SAGE Publications: 203-204.
- Barton, T. D. (2008). Understanding Practitioner Ethnography. *Nurse Researcher*, 15(2): 7-18.
- Batey, M. and D. Lambert. (1990). *The English Garden Tour: A View into the Past*. London, John Murray.
- Baudry, S. (2012). Reclaiming urban space as resistance: The infrapolitics of gardening. *Revue française d'études américaines*, 131(1): 32-48.
- Beetham, D. (2013). *The Legitimation of Power*. Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Beggan, J. K. and A. S. Pruitt. (2014). Leading, following and sexism in social dance: change of meaning as contained secondary adjustments. *Leisure Studies*, 33(5): 508-532.
- Bellchambers, P. (1979). *Scotland's garden survey: the costs and implications of running an important private garden in Scotland: a report of a survey for Scotland's Gardens Scheme and the National Trust for Scotland*. Edinburgh, Scotland's Garden Scheme.
- Belson, W. A. (1981). *The design and understanding of survey questions*. Aldershot, Gower
- Benfield, R. (2013). *Garden tourism*. Wallingford, CAB International.
- Bengtsson, T. T. (2014). What are data? Ethnographic experiences with young offenders. *Qualitative research*, 14(6): 729-744.
- Benn, T. (2006). Power in Society. In A. Blackwell and D. MacKay (Eds.), *Power*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 114-129
- Berger, B. K. (2005). Power over, power with, and power to relations: Critical reflections on public relations, the dominant coalition, and activism. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 17(1): 5-28.
- Bernard, H. R. (2000). *Social research methods*. London, SAGE Publications.

- Bernard, H. R. and G. W. Ryan. (2010). *Analyzing Qualitative Data: Systematic approaches*. London, SAGE publications.
- Bernard, H. R. (2011). *Research Methods in Anthropology*. Plymouth, Altamira Press.
- Berrall, J. S. (1978). *The garden: an illustrated history*. New York, Penguin Books.
- Bhatti, M. and A. Church. (2000). 'I never promised you a rose garden': gender, leisure and home-making. *Leisure studies*, 19(3): 183-197.
- Bhatti, M. and A. Church. (2001). Cultivating natures: homes and gardens in late modernity. *Sociology*, 35(02): 365-383.
- Bhatti, M., A. Church. and A. Claremont. (2014). Peaceful, pleasant and private: the British domestic garden as an ordinary landscape. *Landscape Research*, 39(1): 40-52.
- Bhatti, M., A. Church., A. Claremont. and P. Stenner. (2009). 'I love being in the garden': enchanting encounters in everyday life. *Social & Cultural Geography*, 10(1): 61-76.
- Billo, E. and N. Hiemstra. (2013). Mediating messiness: expanding ideas of flexibility, reflexivity, and embodiment in fieldwork. *Gender, Place & Culture*, 20(3): 313-328.
- Bird, C. M. (2005). How I stopped dreading and learned to love transcription. *Qualitative inquiry*, 11(2): 226-248.
- Black, E. (2011). *The ethics of space, secrecy, and solitude: domestic space in French sixteenth-century literature and visual culture*. PhD thesis, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- Blackshaw, T. (2010). *Leisure*. London, Routledge.
- Blickle, G., C. Diekmann., P. B. Schneider., Y. Kalthöfer. and J. K. Summers. (2012). When modesty wins: Impression management through modesty, political skill, and career success - a two-study investigation. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 21(6): 899-922.
- Blommaert, J. and D. Jie. (2010). *Ethnographic fieldwork: A beginner's guide*. Bristol, Multilingual Matters.
- Boeije, H. (2010). *Analysis in qualitative research*. London, SAGE publications.
- Bogdan, R. and S. K. Biklen. (2007). *Qualitative research for education: an introduction to theories and methods*. Boston, Pearson A & B.
- Bond, G. C. (1990). Fieldnotes: Research in past occurrences. In R. Sanjek. (Ed.) *Fieldnotes: The making of anthropology*. London, Cornell University Press: 273-289.
- Borgatti, S. P. (1998). Elicitation techniques for cultural domain analysis. In J. Schensul. and M. Lcompe. (Eds.) *Ethnographer Toolkit*. Walnut Creek, CA, Altamira Press. 3: 115-151.

- Botterill, D. (2014). Constructionism - A critical realist reply. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 48: 292-298.
- Bottoms, A. E. and J. Tankebe. (2012). Beyond procedural justice: a dialogic approach to legitimacy in criminal justice. *The Journal of criminal law & criminology*, 102(1): 119-170.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital, In J. G. Richardson. (Ed.) *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology and education*, New York, Greenwood.
- Bourdieu, P. (1990). *The Logic of Practice*. Cambridge, Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (2006). The Forms of Capital. In H. Lauder, P. Brown, J. A. Dillabourgh and A. Halsey. (Eds.) *Education, globalization, and social change*. Oxford, Oxford University Press: 105-118
- Bowen, G. A. (2008). Naturalistic inquiry and the saturation concept: a research note. *Qualitative research*, 8(1): 137-152.
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative research journal*, 9(2): 27-40.
- Bower, F. O. (1941). The Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew Centenary as a Government Institution History of the Gardens. *Nature*, 147: 400-402.
- Boyatzis, R. E. (1998). *Transforming qualitative information: Thematic analysis and code development*. London, SAGE Publications.
- Brannen, J. and A. Nilsen. (2011). Comparative biographies in case-based cross-national research: Methodological considerations. *Sociology*, 45(4): 603-618.
- Brewer, J. and A. Hunter (1989). *Multimethod research: A synthesis of styles*. London, SAGE Publications.
- Brimblecombe, P. (2014). Documentary Records. In A. Mackay., R. Battarbee., J. Birks. and F. Oldfield. (Eds.) *Global Change in the Holocene*. London, Routledge: 159-167.
- Brinkmann, S. (2012). *Qualitative Inquiry in Everyday Life: Working with Everyday Life Materials*. London, SAGE Publications.
- British Sociological Association (2002) *Statement of ethical practice*. Unpublished online source, Retrieved December 27th, 2015, from <http://www.britisoc.co.uk/media/27107/StatementofEthicalPractice.pdf>
- Brown, P. H. (1904). *Scotland in the time of Queen Mary*. London, Methuen & Company.
- Browne, K. (2005). Snowball sampling: using social networks to research non-heterosexual women. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 8(1): 47-60.
- Bruce, S. and S. Yearley (2006). *The SAGE dictionary of sociology*. London, SAGE Publications.

- Bryman, A. (2012). *Social research methods* [4th edition]. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Bryman, A. (2016). *Social research methods* [5th edition]. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Buckingham, S. (2005). Women (re) construct the plot: the regen (d) eration of urban food growing. *Area*, 37(2): 171-179.
- Bulkeley, H. (2012). Governance and the geography of authority: modalities of authorisation and the transnational governing of climate change. *Environment and planning A*, 44(10): 2428-2444.
- Buchbinder, E. (2011). Beyond checking: Experiences of the validation interview. *Qualitative Social Work*, 10(1): 106-122.
- Bulmer, M. (1982). *Social research ethics: an examination of the merits of covert participant observation*. London, Macmillan Press.
- Burchard-Dziubińska, M. (2014). Urban farming—underestimated source of ecosystem services: Allotment gardens in Poland case study. *Economics and Environment*, 51(4): 178-186.
- Burchardt, J. (2002). *The Allotment Movement in England: 1793-1873*. Woodbridge, Suffolk, Royal Historical Society.
- Burchardt, J. and J. Cooper. (2010). *Breaking new ground: Nineteenth-century allotments from local sources*. Milton Keynes, Family and Community History Research.
- Burr, V. (2015). *Social constructionism*. Hove, Routledge.
- Bustin. (2011). *Glamour in the greenhouse*. Unpublished online source, Retrieved April 22nd, 2013, from <http://www.ngs.org.uk/about-us/open-for-the-ngs.aspx>.
- Bussell, H. and D. Forbes. (2002). Understanding the volunteer market: The what, where, who and why of volunteering. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 7(3): 244-257.
- Callon, M. (2007). Actor-Network Theory - The Market Test. In K. Asdal., B. Brenna. and I. Moser. (Eds.) *Technoscience: The Politics of Interventions*. Oslo, Unipub: 273-286.
- Campbell, M. and I. Campbell. (2011) *Allotment waiting lists in England 2011*. Transition Town West Kirby in conjunction with the National Society of Allotment and Leisure Gardeners. Unpublished online source, Retrieved August 20th, 2016 from http://transitiontownwestkirby.org.uk/files/ttwk_nsalg_survey_2011.pdf
- Carballo-Cárdenas, E. C., A. P. Mol., and H. Tobi. (2013). Information systems for marine protected areas: How do users interpret desirable data attributes? *Environmental modelling & software*, 41: 185-198.

- Carroll, M. (2003). *Earthly paradises: ancient gardens in history and archaeology*. London, J. Paul Getty Museum.
- Cashore, B. (2002). Legitimacy and the privatization of environmental governance: how non-state market-driven (NSMD) governance systems gain rule-making authority. *Governance*, 15(4): 503-529.
- Charlesworth, M. (1986). The Wentworths: Family and Political Rivalry in the English Landscape Garden. *Garden History*, 14(2): 120-137.
- Charmaz, K. (2014). *Constructing grounded theory*. London, SAGE Publications.
- Chowdhury, M. F. (2014). Interpretivism in aiding our understanding of the contemporary social world. *Open Journal of Philosophy*, 4: 432-438.
- Clegg, S. (2010). The State, Power, and Agency: Missing in Action in Institutional Theory? *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 19(1): 4-13.
- Clemenson, H. A. (1982). *English country houses and landed estates*. New York, St. Martin's Press.
- Clerke, T. and N. Hopwood. (2014). *Doing ethnography in teams: A case study of asymmetric in collaborative research*. Electronically published [Retrieved from <http://www.springer.com/jp/book/9783319056173>], Springer.
- Coles, T. and A. Church. (2007). Tourism, politics and the forgotten entanglements of power. In A. Church and T. Coles. (Eds.) *Tourism, power and space*. London, Routledge: 1-43.
- Collett, J. L. and E. Childs. (2009). Meaningful performances: Considering the contributions of the dramaturgical approach to studying family. *Sociology Compass*, 3(4): 689-706.
- Connell, J. (2002). *A Critical Analysis of Gardens as a Resource for Tourism and Recreation in the UK*. PhD thesis, The University of Plymouth.
- Connell, J. (2004). The purest of human pleasures: the characteristics and motivations of garden visitors in Great Britain. *Tourism Management*, 25(2): 229-247.
- Connell, J. (2005). Managing gardens for visitors in Great Britain: a story of continuity and change. *Tourism Management*, 26(2): 185-201.
- Cook, J. (1997). Empowering people for sustainable development. In P. Fitzgerald., A. McLennan. and B. Munslow. (Eds.) *Managing sustainable development in South Africa*. Cape Town, Oxford University Press: 275-292.
- Coole, M., D. J. Brooks. and D. Treagust (2015). The Physical Security Professional: Formulating a Novel Body of Knowledge. *Journal of Applied Security Research*, 10(3): 385-410.
- Corbin, A. (2009). *L'avènement des loisirs: 1850-1960*. Paris, Flammarion.
- Coskuner-Balli, G. and C. J. Thompson. (2013). The status costs of subordinate cultural capital: At-home fathers' collective pursuit of cultural legitimacy

- through capitalizing consumption practices. *Journal of consumer research*, 40(1): 19-41.
- Cowie, S. E. (2011). The Plurality of Power in Industrial Capitalism: A Case Study of Fayette, Michigan. In S. E. Cowie (Ed.). *The Plurality of Power*. London, Springer: 1-10
- Crabtree, A., M. Rouncefield. and P. Tolmie. (2012). *Doing design ethnography*. London, Springer
- Cryer, P. (2006). *The research student's guide to success*. Maidenhead, Open University Press.
- Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*. London, SAGE Publications.
- Crouch, D. (1992). *The image of aristocracy in Britain, 1000-1300*. London, Routledge.
- Crouch, D. (2005). *The birth of nobility: constructing aristocracy in England and France: 900-1300*. Harlow, England, Pearson.
- Crouch, D. (2011). *The English aristocracy: 1070-1272: a social transformation*. New Haven, Yale University Press.
- Daldal, A. (2014). Power and ideology in Michel Foucault and Antonio Gramsci: A comparative analysis. *Review of History and Political Science*, 2(2): 149-167.
- Darnall, M. J. (1983). The American Cemetery as Picturesque Landscape: Bellefontaine Cemetery, St. Louis. *Winterthur Portfolio*, 18(4): 249-269.
- Datta, R. (2016). Community garden: A bridging program between formal and informal learning. *Cogent Education*, 3(1177154): 1-14.
- Davidson, C. (2009). Transcription: Imperatives for qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 8(2): 35-52.
- Day, K. W. (2015). *The Activation Process of Theory of Power: An Integrative Framework for Power in the Channels Setting*. Paper presented at Academy of Marketing Science Annual Conference. Denver, Springer: 238-242.
- Decrop, A. (2004). Trustworthiness in qualitative tourism research. In J. Phillimore. and L. Goodson. (Eds.) *Qualitative research in tourism: Ontologies, epistemologies and methodologies*. New York, Routledge: 156-169.
- Denzin, N. K. (2010). Moments, mixed methods, and paradigm dialogs. *Qualitative inquiry*, 16(6): 419-427.
- DeSilvey, C. (2003). Cultivated histories in a Scottish allotment garden. *Cultural Geographies*, 10(4): 442-468.
- DeSilvey, C. (2004). *When plotters meet: Edinburgh's allotment movement 1921–2001*. MSc dissertation, University of Edinburgh.

- Desmond, R. G. C. (1972). The Royal Botanic Garden, Edinburgh. *Kew Bulletin*, 26(2): 382-384.
- Desmond, R. (1975). The Hookers and the development of the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society*, 7(3): 173-182.
- Desmond, R. (1998). *Kew: the history of the Royal Botanic Gardens*. London, Harvill Press with the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew.
- DeWalt, K. M. and B. R. DeWalt. (2011). *Participant observation: a guide for fieldworkers*. Lanham, Md., Rowman & Littlefield.
- Devereaux, R. L. and M. C. Gottlieb. (2012). Record keeping in the cloud: Ethical considerations. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 43(6): 627-632.
- Dickie, J. (1976). The Islamic Garden in Spain. In E. B. MacDougall. and R. Ettinghausen. (Eds.) *The Islamic Garden*. Washington, D.C., Dunbarton Oaks: 87-106.
- Dowding, K. M. (1996). *Power*. Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press.
- Dowding, K. M. (2011). *Encyclopaedia of power*. Thousand Oaks, Calif., SAGE Publications.
- Duncan, F. (2005). Nature's prozac – the long term view. *Countryside Recreation*, 13(1): 13-15.
- Dzakiria, H. (2012). Theory of relatability as a possible alternative to the issue of generalising of research findings: The case of open and distance learning (ODL) at Universiti Utara Malaysia. *Malaysian Journal of Distance Education*, 14(1): 41-58.
- Easterby-Smith, M., T. Richard. and J. Paul R. (2012). *Management research*. London, SAGE Publications.
- Eco, U. (2002). *Art and beauty in the middle ages*. London, Yale University Press.
- Edmonstone, J. (2006). Caring and Sharing: Roots and reminiscences of Scotland's Gardens Scheme. In *Gardens of Scotland*. Edinburgh, Scotland's Gardens Scheme: 4-9.
- Emerson, R. M., R. I., Frets. and L. L., Shaw. (2011). *Writing ethnographic fieldnotes*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- Emmel, N. (2013). *Sampling and choosing cases in qualitative research: a realist approach*. London, SAGE Publications.
- Evans, S. T. (2000). Aztec royal pleasure parks: Conspicuous consumption and elite status rivalry. *Studies in the History of Gardens & Designed Landscapes*, 20(3): 206-228.
- Everson, P. (1996). Bodiam Castle, East Sussex: castle and its designed landscape. *Château Gaillard*, 17: 79-84.

- Fantosme, J. (1840). *Chronicle of the war between the English and the Scots in 1173 and 1174*. Edinburgh, Laing and Forbes.
- Farahani, L. M., B. Motamed. and E. Jamei. (2016). Persian Gardens: Meanings, Symbolism, and Design. *Landscape Online*, 46: 1-19.
- Farmer, D. J. (2006). Imagine! Preface to the post-traditional. *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, 28(2): 169-175.
- Farmer, S. (2013). Aristocratic Power and the “Natural” Landscape: The Garden Park at Hesdin, ca. 1291–1302. *Speculum*, 88(3): 644-680.
- Farrokhi, F. and A. Mahmoudi-Hamidabad. (2012). Rethinking convenience sampling: Defining quality criteria. *Theory and practice in language studies*, 2(4): 784.
- Fereday, J. and E. Muir-Cochrane. (2008). Demonstrating rigor using thematic analysis: A hybrid approach of inductive and deductive coding and theme development. *International journal of qualitative methods*, 5(1): 80-92.
- Fergusson, J. L. F. (1956). Forestry in Perthshire: Notes on past history. *Forestry*, 29(2): 81-89.
- Fetterman, D. M. (2010). *Ethnography: step-by-step*. London, SAGE Publications.
- Fisher, C. B. and A. E. Anushko. (2008). Research Ethics in Social Science. In P. Alasuutari., B. Leonard. and B. Julia. (Eds.) *The SAGE Handbook of Social Research Methods*. London, SAGE Publications: 95-111.
- Fisher, C. B., F. J. Wertz. and S. J. Goodman. (2009). Graduate Training in Responsible Conduct of Social Science Research: The Role of Mentors and Departmental Climate. In D. M. Mertens. and P. E. Ginsberg. (Eds.) *The Handbook of Social Research Ethics*. London, SAGE Publications: 550-564.
- Fiske, S. T. and J. Berdahl. (2007). Social power. In A. W. Kruglanski. and W. T. Higgins. (Eds.) *Social psychology: Handbook of basic principles*. London, The Guilford Press: 678-692.
- Fitzgerald, T. (2012). Documents and documentary analysis: Reading between the lines. In A. R. J. Briggs., M. Coleman. and M. Morrison. (Eds.) *Research methods in educational leadership and management*. London, SAGE Publications: 296-308.
- Fletcher, H. R. and W. H. Brown. (1970). *The Royal Botanic Garden Edinburgh 1670-1970*. Edinburgh, Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
- Flick, U. (2007). *Designing qualitative research*. London, SAGE Publications.
- Flick, U. (2009). *An introduction to qualitative research*. London, SAGE Publications.
- Flick, U. (2014). Mapping the Field. In U. Flick. (Ed.) *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Data Analysis*. London, SAGE Publications: 3-19.
- Flood, A. (2010). Understanding phenomenology. *Nurse Researcher*, 17(2): 7-15.

- Flyvbjerg, B. (2006). Five misunderstandings about case-study research. *Qualitative inquiry*, 12(2): 219-245.
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge*. London, Tavistock Publications.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977*. London, Pantheon.
- Fox, D. (2006). *The influence of social and material agents on garden visiting in England*. Paper presented at Progressing Tourism Research 2006. University of Exeter.
- Fox, D. (2007). *Understanding garden visitors: the affordances of a leisure environment*. PhD thesis, Bournemouth University.
- Fox, D., J. Edwards. and K. Wilkes. (2010). Employing the 'grand tour' approach to aid understanding of garden visiting. In Richards, G. and W. Munsters (Eds.) *Cultural Tourism Research Methods*. Wallingford, Oxon: CABI: 75-86.
- Frain du Tremblay, J. (1685). *Conversations morales sur les jeux et les divertissemens*. Paris, André Pralard.
- Francis, J. J., M. Johnston., C. Robertson., L. Glidewell., V. Entwistle., M. P. Eccles. and J. M. Grimshaw. (2010). What is an adequate sample size? Operationalising data saturation for theory-based interview studies. *Psychology & Health*, 25(10): 1229-1245.
- Franklin, A. (2003). *Tourism: an introduction*. London, SAGE Publications.
- Fuchs, D. (2011). Cultural diversity, European identity and the legitimacy of the EU- a theoretical framework. In D. Fuchs. and H.-D. Klingemann. (Eds.) *Cultural diversity, European identity and the legitimacy of the EU*. Cheltenham, Edward Elgar: 27-57.
- Gadamer, H. G. (1976). *Philosophical Hermeneutics*. London, University of California Press.
- Galbraith, J. K. (1958). *The affluent society*. London, Hamish Hamilton.
- Gallagher, J. (1983). *Visiting historic gardens: A report on contemporary garden visiting and its literature*. Leeds, Planning Research Unit, School of Planning and Environmental Studies, Leeds Polytechnic.
- Gallant, K. and S. Hutchinson. (2016). Perceptions of Power Within a Membership-based Seniors' Community Center. *Leisure Sciences*, 38(4): 357-372.
- Galvin, R. (2015). How many interviews are enough? Do qualitative interviews in building energy consumption research produce reliable knowledge? *Journal of Building Engineering*, 1: 2-12.
- Gard, R. (1989). *The observant traveller. Diaries of travel in England, Wales and Scotland in the County Record Offices of England and Wales*. London, H.M.S.O.

- Garrett, T. M. (1978). *A history of pleasure gardens in New York City, 1700-1865*, PhD thesis, New York University
- Garrod, G., A. Pickering. and K. Willis. (1993). The economic value of botanic gardens: a recreational perspective. *Geoforum*, 24(2): 215-224.
- Gee, N. (2012). *Trouble in the garden: Exploring the ambivalence of public space and private property*. PhD thesis, Goldsmiths College, University of London.
- Gibbon, M. (1977). Stowe, Buckinghamshire: The House and Garden Buildings and Their Designers. *Architectural History*, 20: 31-83.
- Gibbs, G. R. (2007). *Analysing qualitative data*. London, SAGE Publications.
- Gifford, J, C. McWilliam. and D. Walker. (1984). *Edinburgh: the buildings of Scotland*. London, Penguin Books.
- Gill, P. and G. Dolan. (2015). Originality and the PhD: what is it and how can it be demonstrated? *Nurse Researcher*, 22(6): 11-15.
- Girouard, M. (1978). *Life in the English Country House: A Social and Architectural History*. New Haven, Yale University Press.
- Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. London: Penguin Books.
- Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma: notes on the management of spoiled identity*. New York, Simon & Schuster.
- Gold, R. (1958). Roles in Sociological Field Observations. *Social Forces*, 36(3): 217-223.
- Godelier, M. (2011). *The mental and the material: thought economy and society*. London, Verso
- Gomm, R., M. Hammersley. and P. Foster. (2000). Case study and generalization. In R. Gomm, M. Hammersley. and P. Foster. (Eds.) *Case study method*. London, SAGE Publications: 98-115.
- Goreluck, S. (2010). Contradictions of Feminist Methodology. In P. Atkinson. and S. Delamont. (Eds.) *SAGE Qualitative Research Methods*. Thousand Oaks, SAGE Publications: 460-501.
- Gorse, G. L. (1983). Genoese Renaissance villas: a typological introduction. *The Journal of Garden History*, 3(4): 255-280.
- Goulty, S. M. (2003). *Heritage Gardens: Care, Conservation, Management*. London, Routledge.
- Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*. London, Lawrence & Wishart.
- Gregg, A. P., C. M. Hart., C. Sedikides. and M. Kumashiro. (2008). Everyday conceptions of modesty: A prototype analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 34(7): 978-992.

- Guba, E. G. (1990). *The paradigm dialog*. London, SAGE Publications.
- Guba, E. G. and Y. S. Lincoln. (1982). Epistemological and Methodological Bases of Naturalistic Inquiry. *Educational Communication and Technology*, 30(4): 233-252.
- Guetzkow, J., M. Lamont. and G. Mallard. (2004). What is Originality in the Humanities and the Social Sciences? *American Sociological Review*, 69(2): 190-212.
- Guo, B. (2006). Charity for profit? Exploring factors associated with the commercialization of human service nonprofits. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 35(1): 123-138.
- Gunn, W. (2009). *Fieldnotes and sketchbooks: challenging the boundaries between descriptions and processes of describing*. Frankfurt, Peter Lang.
- Hadfield, M. (1979). *A history of British gardening*. London, John Murray.
- Haldane, E. S. (1934). *Scots Gardens in old times (1200-1800)*. London, Alexander Maclehose & Co.
- Haldrup, M. (2004). Laid-back mobilities: Second-home holidays in time and space. *Tourism Geographies*, 6(4): 434-454.
- Haldrup, M. (2011). Choreographies of leisure mobilities. In M. Büscher., J. Urry. and K. Witchger. (Eds.) *Mobile methods*. London, Routledge: 54-71.
- Haldrup, M. and J. Larsen. (2006). Material cultures of tourism. *Leisure studies*, 25(3): 275-289.
- Hamill, C. and H. A. Sinclair. (2010). Bracketing—practical considerations in Husserlian phenomenological research: Conal Hamill and Helen Sinclair discuss bracketing in Husserlian phenomenological research. *Nurse Researcher*, 17(2): 16-24.
- Hammersley, M. and P. Atkinson. (2007). *Ethnography: Principles in practice*. Oxford, Routledge.
- Hantrais, L. (2009). *International comparative research: theory, methods and practice*. Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hareli, S. and B. Weiner. (2000). Accounts for success as determinants of perceived arrogance and modesty. *Motivation and Emotion*, 24(3): 215-236.
- Harvey, J. H. (1987). The Square Garden of Henry the Poet. *Garden History*, 15(1): 1-11.
- Haug, B. (2012). Enacting Risk at Besseggen. In van der Duim. R., C. Ren and G. T. Jóhannesson. (Eds.) *Actor-Network theory and tourism: ordering, materiality and multiplicity*. Abingdon, Oxon, Routledge: 80-93.
- Haugaard, M. (2002). *Power: a reader*. Manchester, Manchester University Press

- Haugaard, M. (2009). Power and Hegemony. In R. Clegg and M. Haugaard. (Eds.) *The SAGE handbook of power*. London, SAGE Publications: 239-256.
- Haugaard, M. (2012). Rethinking the four dimensions of power: domination and empowerment. *Journal of Political Power*, 5(1), 33-54.
- Hawkins, D. (2012). Constructivism: some history. In P. Fensham, R. Gunstone and R. White. (Eds.) *The Content of Science: A Constructive Approach to Its Teaching and Learning*. London, Routledge: 9-13.
- Head, L. and J. Atchison. (2009). Cultural ecology: emerging human-plant geographies. *Progress in Human Geography*, 33(2): 236-245.
- Hearn, J. (2011). Domination. In K. M. Dowding. (Ed.) *Encyclopedia of power*. London, SAGE Publications: 204-207.
- Hearn, J. (2012). *Theorizing power*. London, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hearn, J. (2013). Competition as Ritual and the Legitimation of the Liberal Nation State. In R. Tsang and E. T. Woods. (Eds.) *The Cultural Politics of Nationalism and Nation-Building: Ritual and Performance in the Forging of Nations*. Abingdon, Oxon, Routledge: 68-84.
- Heizmann, H., M. R. Olsson. and R. Chase. (2015). Power matters: The importance of Foucault's power/knowledge as a conceptual lens in KM research and practice. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 19(4): 756-769.
- Hepper, F. N. (1982). *Royal Botanic Gardens Kew: gardens for science & pleasure*. London, Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
- Hickley, A. (2007) *Finding Affordable Transcription for Research Interviews*. Unpublished online source, Retrieved 22nd May, 2016, from <http://ezinearticles.com/?Finding-Affordable-Transcription-for-Research-Interviews&id=473893>
- Highland, J. (2005). Transformative Katharsis: The Significance of Theophrastus's Botanical Works for Interpretations of Dramatic Catharsis. *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, 63(2): 155-163.
- Hignett, S. and H. McDermott. (2015). Qualitative Methodology. In J. R. Wilson. and S. Sharples. (Eds.) *Evaluation of Human Work*. London, CRC Press: 119-138.
- Hilbig, B. E., T. Heydasch. and I. Zettler. (2014). To boast or not to boast: Testing the humility aspect of the Honesty–Humility factor. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 69: 12-16.
- Hill, A. W. (1915). The History and Functions of Botanic Gardens. *Annals of the Missouri Botanical Garden*, 2(1/2): 185-240.
- Himmelsbach, I., R. Glaser., J. Schoenbein., D. Riemann. and B. Martin. (2015). Reconstruction of flood events based on documentary data and transnational flood risk analysis of the Upper Rhine and its French and German tributaries since AD 1480. *Hydrology & Earth System Sciences*, 19(10): 4149-4164.

- Hitchings, R. (2003). People, plants and performance: on actor network theory and the material pleasures of the private garden. *Social & Cultural Geography*, 4(1): 99-114.
- Hitchings, R. (2004). At home with someone nonhuman. *Home Culture*, 1(2): 169-186.
- Hodgetts, D., O. Stolte., A. Radley., C. Leggatt-Cook., S. Groot. and K. Chamberlain. (2011). 'Near and Far': Social Distancing in Domiciled Characterisations of Homeless People. *Urban Studies*, 48(8): 1739-1753.
- Holmes, J. and M. Stubbe. (2015). *Power and politeness in the workplace: A sociolinguistic analysis of talk at work*. London, Routledge.
- Holstein, J. A. and J. F. Gubrium. (2003). Active Interviewing. In J. F. Gubrium. and J. A. Holstein. (Eds.) *Postmodern interviewing*. London, SAGE Publications: 67-80.
- Holstein, J. A. and J. F. Gubrium. (2008). Constructionist impulses in ethnographic fieldwork. In J. A. Holstein. and J. F. Gubrium. (Eds.) *Handbook of Constructionist Research*. London, Guilford Press: 373-395.
- Holstein, J. A. and J. F. Gubrium. (2011). Animating interview narratives. In D. Silverman. (Ed.) *Qualitative research*. London, SAGE Publications: 149-167.
- Homer (1874). *The Iliad and Odyssey of Homer*, A. Pope. (trans.). London, George Routledge and Sons.
- Homer (2008). *The Odyssey*, W. Shewring (trans.). Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Hooker, W. J. (2013). *Kew Gardens: Or, A Popular Guide to the Royal Botanic Gardens of Kew*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Howse, C. (2006). From Lady Bountiful to Lady Administrator: women and the administration of rural district nursing in England, 1880–1925. *Women's History Review*, 15(3): 423-441.
- Howse, C. (2007). "The Ultimate Destination of All Nursing": The Development of District Nursing in England, 1880-1925. *Nursing History Review*, 15: 65-94.
- Huizinga, J. (1996). *The autumn of the Middle Ages*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press
- Hunt, J. D. and P. Willis. (1988). *The genius of the place: The English landscape garden, 1620-1820*. London, MIT Press.
- Hunter, F. (1953). *Community power structure; a study of decision makers*. Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press.
- Husserl, E. (1965). *Phenomenology and the Crisis of Philosophy*. New York, Harper & Row.
- Hutton, R. (2001). *The rise and fall of merry England: the ritual year, 1400-1700*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

- Isobel, Marchioness of Graham. (1981). Roots: The growth of Scotland's Gardens Scheme. In *Scotland's Gardens*. Edinburgh, Scotland's Gardens Scheme: 7-10.
- Israel, M. (2015). *Research ethics and integrity for social scientists: Beyond regulatory compliance*. London, SAGE Publications.
- James, K. (2005). 'Curious Scotch Plants': Scotland as the Exotic in the Early Edinburgh Physic Garden. *Lumen: Selected Proceedings from the Canadian Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies [Lumen:/Travaux choisis de la Société canadienne d'étude du dix-huitième siècle]*, 24: 135-148.
- Janick, J. (2014). Horticulture and Art. In G. R. Dixon. and D. Aldous. (Eds.) *Horticulture: Plants for People and Places*. Dordrecht, Springer, 3: 1197-1223.
- Jashemski, W. F. (1996). Ancient Roman gardens in Campania and Tunisia: A comparison of the evidence. *The Journal of Garden History*, 16(4): 231-243.
- Jashimuddin, M., M. Alamgir., R. Majumder., M. R. A. Patwary. and M. A. R. Bhuiyan. (2004). Potential Visitors of Mirpur Zoological Garden as an Outdoor Recreation Area of Dhaka, Bangladesh. *Pakistan Journal of Biological Sciences*, 7(9): 1509-1512.
- Jellicoe, G., S. Jellicoe., P. Goode. and M. Lancaster. (Eds.). (1991). *The Oxford Companion to Gardens*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Jellicoe, S. (1976). The development of the Mughal garden. In E. MacArthur and R. Ettinghausen. (Eds.) *The Islamic Garden*. Washington, D.C., Dumbarton Oaks: 107-130.
- Jóhannesson, G. T., R. van der Duim., and C. Ren. (2012). Introduction. In van der Duim. R., C. Ren. and G. T. Jóhannesson. (Eds.) *Actor-Network theory and tourism: ordering, materiality and multiplicity*. Abingdon, Oxon, Routledge: 1-12.
- Johnston, C. (2008). Beyond the clearing: towards a dwelt animal geography. *Progress in human geography*, 32(5): 633-649.
- Kaiser, K. (2009). Protecting respondent confidentiality in qualitative research. *Qualitative Health Research*, 19(11): 1632-1641.
- Karlsson-Vinkhuyzen, S. I. (2016). Legitimacy. In C. Ansell. and J. Torfing. (Eds.) *Handbook on Theories of Governance*. Cheltenham, Edward Elgar Publishing: 197-204.
- Kay, P., A. M. Hede., J. Inglis. and M. Polonsky. (2008). *Applicability of leisure theory in managerial views on volunteerism in a volunteer managed nonprofit organisation: some preliminary findings*. Paper presented at Australian and New Zealand Marketing Academy Conference 2008. Auckland, New Zealand.
- Kelliher, F. (2011). Interpretivism and the pursuit of research legitimisation: an integrated approach to single case design. *Leading Issues in Business Research Methods*, 1(2): 123-131.

- Kennedy, M. M. (1979). Generalizing from single case studies. *Evaluation Quarterly*, 3(4): 661-678.
- King, N. (1998). Template analysis. In G. Symon. and C. Cassell. (Eds.) *Qualitative Methods and Analysis in organizational Research*. London, SAGE Publications.
- Kinnard, J. A. (1986). The Villa Gamberaia in Settignano: the street in the garden. *The Journal of Garden History*, 6(1): 1-18.
- Koelsch, L. E. (2013). Reconceptualizing the member check interview. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 12(1): 168-179.
- Kohlleppel, T., J. C. Bradley. and S. Jacob. (2002). A walk through the garden: Can a visit to a botanic garden reduce stress? *Hort Technology*, 12(3): 489-492.
- Konopinski, N. (2014). *Doing anthropological research: a practical guide*. London, Routledge.
- Koppell, J. G. (2008). Global governance organizations: Legitimacy and authority in conflict. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(2): 177-203.
- Knappett, C. and L. Malafouris. (Eds.). (2008). *Material Agency: Towards a Non-Anthropocentric Approach*. Berlin: Springer.
- Krause, T. and T. D. Nielsen. (2014). The legitimacy of incentive-based conservation and a critical account of social safeguards. *Environmental Science & Policy*, 41: 44-51.
- Krüger, S. (2012). Life in the Domestic Realm - Male Identity in the Secret Garden. In M. Gymnich. and I. Lichterfeld. (Eds.) *A Hundred Years of the Secret Garden: Frances Hodgson Burnett's Children's Classic Revisited*. Goettingen, V & R unipress: 69-76.
- Laird, M. (1999). *The flowering of the landscape garden: English pleasure grounds, 1720-1800*. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Lambert, D. and J. Lovie (2006). All Rosy in the Garden? *Journal of Architectural Conservation*, 12(3): 83-106.
- Landsberg, S. (2003). *The medieval garden*. Toronto, University of Toronto Press.
- LaPiere, R. T. (2010). Attitudes vs Actions. *International journal of epidemiology*, 39(1): 7-11.
- Latour, B. (1999). On recalling ANT. *The Sociological Review*, 47(S1): 15-25.
- Latour, B. (2007). *Reassembling the social-an introduction to actor-network-theory*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Law, J. (1999). After ANT: complexity, naming and topology. *The Sociological Review*, 47(S1): 1-14.

- Law, J. (2009). Actor network theory and material semiotics. In B. S. Turner. (Ed.) *The new Blackwell companion to social theory*. Chichester, Blackwell Publishing: 141-158.
- Lee, C. J. G. (2012). Reconsidering constructivism in qualitative research. *Educational Philosophy and theory*, 44(4): 403-412.
- Leitch, C. M., F. M. Hill and R. T. Harrison. (2010). The Philosophy and Practice of Interpretivist Research in Entrepreneurship. *Organizational Research Methods*, 13(1): 67-84.
- Lemelin, R. H. (2013). To bee or not to bee: whether 'tis nobler to revere or to revile those six-legged creatures during one's leisure. *Leisure studies*, 32(2): 153-171.
- Le Vasseur, J. J. (2003). The problem of bracketing in phenomenology. *Qualitative Health Research*, 13(3): 408-420.
- Lincoln, Y. S. and E. G. Guba. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, SAGE Publications.
- Lincoln, Y. S. and E. G. Guba (2000). Paradigmatic Controversies, Contradictions, and Emerging Confluences. In N. Denzin. and Y. Lincoln. (Eds.) *Handbook of qualitative research*. London, SAGE Publications.
- Lincoln, Y. S., S. A. Lynham. and E. G. Guba. (2011). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences, revisited. In N. K. Denzin. and Y. S. Lincoln. (Eds.) *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, SAGE Publications: 97-128.
- Link, B. G. and J. C. Phelan. (2001). Conceptualizing Stigma. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 27: 363-385.
- Link, B. G. and J. C. Phelan. (2013). Labeling and stigma. In C. S. Aneshensel., J. C. Phelan. and A. Bierman. (Eds.) *Handbook of the sociology of mental health*. New York, Springer: 525-541.
- Link, B. G. and J. Phelan. (2014). Stigma power. *Social Science & Medicine* 103: 24-32.
- Lipovská, B. (2013). The fruit of garden tourism may fall over the wall: Small private gardens and tourism. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 6: 114-121.
- Littlejohn, D. and S. Littlejohn (1997). *The fate of the English country house*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Littlewood, A. R. (1987). Ancient literary evidence for the pleasure gardens of Roman country villas. In E. B. MacDougall. (Ed.) *Ancient Roman villa gardens*. Washington, D.C., Dumbarton Oaks: 7-30.
- Lopez, K. A. and D. G. Willis (2004). Descriptive Versus Interpretive Phenomenology: Their Contributions to Nursing Knowledge. *Qualitative Health Research*, 14(5): 726-735.

- Lovett, F. N. (2001). Domination: A Preliminary Analysis. *The Monist*, 84(1): 98-112.
- Lovett, F. (2009). Domination and Distributive Justice. *The Journal of Politics*, 71(3): 817-830.
- Lowe, A. (2001). After ANT - An illustrative discussion of the implications for qualitative accounting case research, *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 14(3): 327-351.
- Lowrey, J. (2007). Practical Palladianism: The Scottish Country House and the concept of the villa in the late seventeenth century. *Architectural Heritage*, 18(1): 151-167.
- Lukes, S. (2005). *Power: A radical view*. New York, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Lund, K. and D. D. Suthers. (2013). Methodological Dimensions. In D. D. Suthers., K. Lund., P. C. Rosé., C. Teplovs. and N. Law. (Eds.) *Productive Multivocality in the Analysis of Group Interactions*. Boston, MA, Springer US: 21-35.
- MacDougall, E. B. (1972). Ars hortulorum: sixteenth century garden iconography and literary theory in Italy. In D. R. Coffin. (Ed.) *The Italian Garden*. Washington, D.C., Dumbarton Oaks: 37-60.
- MacKenzie, D. (1984). Marx and the Machine. *Technology and Culture*, 25(3): 473-502.
- Malcolmson, R. W. (1973). *Popular recreations in English society, 1700-1850*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Mandler, P. (1997). *The fall and rise of the stately home*. New Haven, Yale University Press.
- Marcuse, H. (1974). *Eros and civilization: A philosophical inquiry into Freud*. Boston, Beacon Press.
- Mast, M. S., D. Frauendorfer. and L. Popovic. (2011). Self-promoting and modest job applicants in different cultures. *Journal of Personnel Psychology* 10(2): 70-77.
- Martin, E., T. Easton. and I. McKechnie. (1993). Conspicuous display: the extraordinary garden and buildings of a minor gentry family in mid-Suffolk. *Proceedings of the Suffolk Institute of Archaeology and History*, XXXVIII (1): 56-74.
- Marx, K. (1978). Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844. In R. Tucker. (Ed.) *The Marx-Engels Reader*. New York, W. W. Norton & Company: 66-125
- Masson, G. (1972). Italian flower collectors' gardens in seventeenth century Italy. In D. R. Coffin. (Ed.) *The Italian Garden*. Washington, D.C., Dumbarton Oaks: 61-80.

- Mausner, C. (1996). A Kaleidoscope Model: Defining Natural Environments. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 16(4): 335-348.
- Mauthner, N. S. (2012) 'Accounting for Our Part of the Entangled Webs We Weave': Ethical and Moral Issues in Digital Data Sharing. In T. Miller., M. Birch., M. Mauthner. and J. Jessop. (Eds.) *Ethics in Qualitative Research*. London, SAGE Publications: 157-176.
- McCool, S. F. and K. E. Khumalo. (2015). Empowering managers: Enhancing the performance of protected area tourism managers in the twenty-first century. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 40(2): 169-180.
- Merriam, C. E. (1940). Book review: Mosca 1939 'The Ruling Class (Elementi di scienza politica)'. *The American Historical Review*, 45(3): 605-606.
- Merriman, P. (2015). Mobilities I: Departures. *Progress in Human Geography*, 39(1), 87-95.
- McKay, S., D. Moro., S. Teasdale. and D. Clifford. (2011). The marketisation of charities in England and Wales. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 26(1): 336-354.
- McIlveen, P. (2008). Autoethnography as a Method for Reflexive Research and Practice in Vocational Psychology. *Australian Journal of Career Development*, 17(2): 13-20.
- Miles, M. B. and A. M. Huberman. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. London, SAGE Publications.
- Miller, T. (2012). Reconfiguring Research Relationships: Regulation, New Technologies and Doing Ethical Research. In T. Miller., M. Birch., M. Mauthner. and J. Jessop. (Eds.) *Ethics in Qualitative Research*. London, SAGE Publications: 29-42.
- Miller, L. and L. Bell. (2012). Consenting to What? Issues of Access, Gate-Keeping and 'Informed' Consent. In M. Hammersley and A. Traianou. (Eds.) *Ethics in Qualitative Research*. London, SAGE Publications: 61-76.
- Mills, C. W. (1956). *The Power Elite*. New York, Oxford University Press.
- Mitchell, B. R. and D. Phyllis. (1962). *Abstract of British Historical Statistics Cambridge*, Cambridge University Press.
- Moore, R. (2012). Capital. In M. Grenfell. (Ed.) *Pierre Bourdieu: Key Concepts*. Durham, Acumen: 98-113.
- Morgan, M., P. Lugosi. and J. B. Ritchie. (Eds.). (2010). *The tourism and leisure experience: Consumer and managerial perspectives*. Bristol, Channel View Publications.
- Morriss, P. (1987). *Power: a philosophical analysis*. Manchester, Manchester University Press.
- Mosca, G. (1939). *The Ruling Class*. London, McGraw-Hill Book Company.

- Munro, R. (2009). Actor-network theory. In S. R. Clegg. and M. Haugaard. (Eds.) *The SAGE handbook of power*. London, SAGE Publications: 125-139.
- Murphy, R. H. (2016). The willingness-to-pay for Caplanian irrationality. *Rationality and Society*, 28(1): 52-82.
- Murray, D. and S. Chua. (2015). What is leadership?. In I. O'Boyle., D. Murray. and P. Commins. (Eds.) *Leadership in Sport*. London, Routledge: 9-18.
- NGS. (1980). *Gardens of England and Wales open to the public*. London: The National Gardens Scheme.
- NGS. (1990). *Gardens of England and Wales open to the public*. London: The National Gardens Scheme.
- NGS. (2000). *Gardens of England and Wales open to the public*. London: The National Gardens Scheme.
- NGS. (2013). *Are you interested in opening your garden?*, Unpublished online source, Retrieved August 22nd, 2016, from <http://www.ngs.org.uk/Upload/Get-involved/Open-your-garden/Interested-In-Opening-Your-Garden.pdf>
- NGS. (2014). *The Yellow Book 2014*. London, Constable
- NGS. (2015a). *The yellow Book 2015*. London, Constable
- NGS. (2015b). *Annual report and financial statements 2015*. Unpublished online source, Retrieved May 4th, 2016, from <http://www.ngs.org.uk/Upload/What-we-do/Annual-reports/NGS%202015-2016%20Accounts.pdf>
- Nikkhah, H. A., M. Redzuan., and A. Abu-Samah. (2011). Development of 'Power within' among the Women: A Road to Empowerment. *Asian Social Science* 8(1): 39-46.
- Nye, J. S. (2004). *Soft power: the means to success in world politics*. New York, Public Affairs.
- Omona, J. (2013). Sampling in Qualitative Research: Improving the Quality of Research Outcomes in Higher Education. *Makerere Journal of Higher Education*, 4(2): 169-185.
- Onwuegbuzie, A. J., N. L. Leech. and K. M. T. Collins. (2012). Qualitative Analysis Techniques for the Review of the Literature. *Qualitative Report*, 17(56): 1-28.
- Panelli, R. (2010). More-than-human social geographies: posthuman and other possibilities. *Progress in Human Geography*, 34(1): 79-87.
- Pansardi, P. (2012). Power to and power over: two distinct concepts of power? *Journal of Political Power*, 5(1): 73-89.
- Patton, M. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation method*. Thousand Oaks, SAGE Publications.

- Pareto, V. (1968). *The Rise and Fall of the Elites: An Application of Theoretical Sociology*. Totowa, N.J., Bedminster Press.
- Parsons, T. (1957). The Distribution of Power in American Society. *World Politics*, 10(1): 123-143.
- Passerini, L. (2012). Expert voices. How many qualitative interviews is enough? In S. E. Baker and R. Edwards. (Eds.) *National Centre for Research Methods Review Paper*. Unpublished online source, retrieved June 22nd, 2016, from <http://eprints.ncrm.ac.uk/2273>
- Peaslee, R. M. (2010). 'The man from New Line knocked on the door': Tourism, media power, and Hobbiton/Matamata as bounded space. *Tourist Studies*, 10(1): 57-73.
- Phillips, E., D. Pugh. and C. Johnston (2015). *How to get a PhD: a handbook for students and their supervisors*. Maidenhead, Open University Press.
- Pike, K. L. (1954). *Language in relation to a unified theory of the structure of human behavior*. California, University of California: Summer Institute of Linguistic.
- Pinder-Wilson, R. (1976). *The Persian Garden: bagh and chahar bagh*. Washington, D. C., Dumbarton Oaks.
- Poland, B. D. (1995). Transcription Quality as an Aspect of Rigor in Qualitative Research. *Qualitative inquiry*, 1(3): 290-310.
- Ponterotto, J. G. (2005). Qualitative research in counseling psychology: A primer on research paradigms and philosophy of science. *Journal of counseling psychology*, 52(2): 126.
- Poulantzas, N. (1986). Class power. In S. Lukes. (Ed.) *Power*. Oxford, Oxford University Press: 144-155.
- Posthuma, R., C. Montes., D. Rodríguez. and G. Serrano. (2012). Affective choice of conflict management styles. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 23(1): 6-18.
- Potter, A. (2011). *The Authenticity Hoax: Why the "real" things we seek don't make us happy*. New York, Harper Perennial.
- Power, E. R. (2005). Human-nature relations in suburban gardens. *Australian Geographer*, 36(1): 39-53.
- Prakoso, S. (2004). The Borrowed Landscape in Garden Design. *Jurnal Ilmiah Arsitektur*, 1(2): 87-99.
- Prior, L. (2016). Using documents in social research. In D. Silverman. (Ed.) *Qualitative research*. London SAGE Publications: 171-186.
- Prosser, J. and A. Loxley. (2008). *Introducing visual methods* (ESRC National Centre for Research Method Review Paper). Unpublished online source, Retrieved August 22nd, 2016, from <http://eprints.ncrm.ac.uk/420/1/MethodsReviewPaperNCRM-010.pdf>

- Punch, K. F. (2013). *Introduction to social research: Quantitative and qualitative approaches*. London, SAGE Publications.
- Puppi, L. (1972). The Villa Garden of the Veneto. In D. R. Coffin. (Ed.) *The Italian Garden*. Washington, D.C., Dumbarton Oaks: 81-114.
- QNI. (1927a, Jul 12th). *Minute of the General Purposes Sub-Committee*, Unpublished, The Queen's Nursing Institute.
- QNI. (1927b, Jul 21st). *Minute of the Garden Sub-Committee*, Unpublished, The Queen's Nursing Institute.
- QNI. (1938, Nov 8th). *Minute of the Gardens Committee*, Unpublished, The Queen's Nursing Institute.
- QNI. (1946, Oct 29th). *Minute of a conference between the county organisers and members of the Gardens Committee*, Unpublished, The Queen's Nursing Institute.
- QNI. (1948, Oct 5th). *A minute of a Special Meeting of the Gardens Committee*, Unpublished, The Queen's Nursing Institute.
- QNI. (1952, Apr 22nd). *Minute of the Gardens Committee*, Unpublished, The Queen's Nursing Institute.
- QNI. (1953a, Oct 8th). *Minute of the Gardens Sub-Committee*, Unpublished, The Queen's Nursing Institute.
- QNI. (1953b, Dec 10th). *Minute of the Gardens Sub-Committee*, Unpublished, The Queen's Nursing Institute.
- QNI. (1980). *Annual Report of the Queen's Nursing Institute*. Unpublished, The Queen's Nursing Institute.
- QNI. (1980). *Annual Report of the Queen's Nursing Institute*. Unpublished, The Queen's Nursing Institute.
- Quest-Ritson, C. (2003). *The English Garden: A Social History*. Boston, David R. Godine Publisher.
- Rapport, N. (2013). The Interview as a Form of Talking-partnership: Dialectical, Focussed, Ambiguous, Special. In J. Skinner. (Ed.) *The Interview: An Ethnographic Approach*. London, BERG: 53-68.
- Redford, B. (1996). *Venice and the Grand Tour*. New Haven, Yale University Press.
- Reid, J. (1683). *The Scots Gard'ner*. Edinburgh, David Lindsay and his Partners.
- Ren, C. (2011). Non-human agency, radical ontology and tourism realities. *Annals of Tourism Research* 38(3): 858-881.
- Ren, C., G. T. Jóhannesson. and R. van der Duim. (2012). How ANT works. In R. van der Duim., C. Ren. and G. T. Jóhannesson. (Eds.) *Actor-Network theory and tourism: ordering, materiality and multiplicity*. Abingdon, Oxon, Routledge: 13-25.

- Reynolds, R. (2014). *On guerrilla gardening: A handbook for gardening without boundaries*. London, Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Richards, G. (2010). Tips for the Postgraduate Supervisor: Integrating Ethics with Research Supervision. *Research Ethics Review*, 6(4): 164-167.
- Riley, R. B. (1990). Flowers, power and sex. In M. Francis. and a. R. T. Hester. (Eds.) *The Meaning of Gardens*. Cambridge, MIT Press: 60-75.
- Ritchie, J. and J. Lewis. (2003). *Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers*. London, SAGE Publications.
- Robson, C. (2011). *Real world research: a resource for users of social research methods in applied settings*. Chichester, Wiley.
- Rodwell, M. K. (2015). *Social work constructivist research*. London, Routledge.
- Roger, A. (1982). *Conservation and Innovation in Scottish Gardens. Scotland's Gardens*. Edinburgh, Scotland's Gardens Scheme.
- Rohl, D. J. (2011). The chorographic tradition and seventeenth-and eighteenth-century Scottish antiquaries. *Journal of Art Historiography Number*, 5: 1-18.
- Rojek, C. (2000). Leisure and the rich today: Veblen's thesis after a century. *Leisure studies*, 19(1): 1-15.
- Ross, S. (1998). *What gardens mean*. London, University of Chicago Press.
- Roulston, K. (2014). Analysing Interviews. In U. Flick. (Ed.) *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Data Analysis*. London, SAGE Publications: 297-313.
- Ryan, C. and C. Bates (1995). A rose by any other name: The motivations of those opening their gardens for a festival. *Festival Management and Event Tourism*, 3(2): 59-71.
- Saldaña, J. (2015). *Thinking Qualitatively: Methods of Mind*. London, SAGE Publications.
- Schadewitz, N. and T. Jachna. (2007). *Comparing inductive and deductive methodologies for design patterns identification and articulation*. Paper presented at International Design Research Conference IADSR 2007 'Emerging Trends in Design Research'. Hong Kong.
- Schwandt, T. A. (Ed.). (2007). *The SAGE dictionary of qualitative inquiry*. Los Angeles, SAGE Publications.
- Scott, J. (1990). *A matter of record: documentary sources in social research*. Cambridge, Polity Press.
- Scott, J. (2001). *Power*. Cambridge, Polity Press.
- Scott, J. (2006). *Sociology: The key concepts*. Abingdon, Routledge.
- Scott, J. (2007). *Fifty key sociologists: The contemporary theorists*. Abingdon, Routledge.

- Scott, W. R. (2014). *Institutions and organizations: ideas, interests & identities*. Los Angeles, SAGE Publications.
- Scott, J. and G. Marshall. (Eds.). (2009). *A Dictionary of Sociology*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- SG. (2011). *Garden Owners' Information Pack*. Unpublished, Scotland's Gardens.
- SG. (2012a). *Guidelines for District Organisers*. Unpublished, Scotland's Gardens.
- SG. (2012). *Our Guide for 2012: Full listing of Open Gardens across Scotland*. Edinburgh, Scotland's Gardens.
- SG. (2013). *Garden Results & District Totals 2009-2013*, Unpublished, Scotland's Gardens.
- SG. (2014). *Our Guide for 2014: Full listing of Open Gardens across Scotland*. Edinburgh, Scotland's Gardens.
- SGS. (1953a). *Visit Scotland's Gardens*. Edinburgh, Scotland's Gardens Scheme.
- SGS. (1953b, Oct 30th). *Report for the Queen's Institute Council Meeting*. Unpublished, Scotland's Gardens Scheme.
- SGS. (1955). *Visit Scotland's Gardens*. Edinburgh, Scotland's Gardens Scheme.
- SGS. (1962). *Scotland's Gardens*. Edinburgh, Scotland's Gardens Scheme.
- SGS. (1991). *Scotland's Gardens*. Edinburgh, Scotland's Gardens Scheme.
- SGS. (1995). *Gardens of Scotland*. Edinburgh, Scotland's Gardens Scheme.
- SGS. (2009). *Gardens of Scotland*. Edinburgh, Scotland's Gardens Scheme.
- Sharma, D. (2009). Research Ethics and Sensitive Behaviors: Underground Economy. In D. M. Mertens. and P. E. Ginsberg. (Eds.) *The Handbook of Social Research Ethics*. Thousand Oaks, CA, SAGE Publications: 426-442.
- Shaw, I. (1999). *Qualitative Evaluation*. London, SAGE Publications.
- Silverman, D. (2001). *Interpreting qualitative data: methods for analysing talk, text and interaction*. London, SAGE Publications.
- Silverman, D. (2011). *Interpreting qualitative data*. London, SAGE Publications.
- Silverman, D. (2013). *Doing qualitative research*. London, SAGE Publications.
- Simmel, G. (1921). The sociological significance of the stranger. In R. E. Park. and E. W. Burgess. (Eds.) *Introduction to the Science of Sociology*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press: 322-327.
- Sixsmith, J. and C. D. Murray. (2001). Ethical issues in the documentary data analysis of Internet posts and archives. *Qualitative Health Research*, 11(3): 423-432.

- Society for Bettering the Conditions and Increasing the Comforts of the Poor (1802). *Reports of the Society for Bettering the Condition and Increasing the Comforts of the Poor*. London, W. Bulmer and Co. 3.
- Spradley, J. P. (1980). *Participant observation*. London, Wadsworth.
- Social Research Association (2003) *Ethical Guidelines*. Unpublished online source, Retrieved December 27th, 2015, from <http://the-sra.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/ethics03.pdf>
- Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. London, SAGE Publications.
- Stake, R. E. (2006). *Multiple case study analysis*. London, Guilford Press.
- Stebbins, R. A. (2000). Obligation as an aspect of leisure experience. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 32(1): 152-155.
- Steffen, E. (2015). Ethical Considerations in Qualitative Research. In E. Lyons. and A. Coyle. (Eds.) *Analysing qualitative data in psychology*. London, SAGE Publications: 31-44.
- Steinberg, P. F. (2015). Can We Generalize from Case Studies? *Global Environmental Politics*, 15(3): 152-175.
- Stout, M. (2013). *Logics of legitimacy: three traditions of public administration praxis*. Boca Raton, CRC Press.
- Sturzaker, J. and M. Shucksmith. (2011). Planning for housing in rural England: Discursive power and spatial exclusion. *The Town Planning Review*, 82(2): 169-193.
- Stucky, H. L. (2014). The first step in Data Analysis: Transcribing and managing qualitative research data. *Methodological Issues in Social Health and Diabetes Research*, 2(1): 6-8.
- Sutton, E., S. Pemberton., E. Fahmy. and Y. Tamiya. (2014). Stigma, Shame and the Experience of Poverty in Japan and the United Kingdom. *Social Policy and Society*, 13(1): 143-154.
- Swartwood, M. M. E. (2012). *The guerrilla in the garden*, Master's dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Swedberg, R. and O. Agevall. (2005). *The Max Weber dictionary: key words and central concepts*, Stanford, Stanford University Press.
- Taber, K. S. (2010). Constructivism and Direct Instruction as Competing Instructional Paradigms: An Essay Review of Tobias and Duffy's Constructivist Instruction: Success or Failure?. *Education Review*, 13(8): 1-45.
- Taylor-Leduc, S. (1999). Luxury in the garden: La Nouvelle Héloïse reconsidered. *Studies in the History of Gardens & Designed Landscapes*, 19(1): 74-85.
- Teddle, C. and F. Yu. (2007). Mixed methods sampling: A typology with examples. *Journal of mixed methods research*, 1(1): 77-100.

- Thacker, C. (1979). *The history of gardens*. Berkeley, University of California Press.
- Thomas, G. (2016). *How to do your case study*. London, SAGE Publications.
- Thompson, J. L. (1990). Hermeneutic inquiry. In L. E. Moody. (Ed.) *Advancing Nursing Science Through Research*. London, SAGE Publications: 223-280.
- Thompson, C. (2016). Hegemony Without Tears: Definitions and uses of hegemony from Gramsci onwards. *Constellations*, 7(2): 36-47.
- Thompson, P. and C. Smith. (2009). Labour power and labour process: Contesting the marginality of the sociology of work. *Sociology*, 43(5): 913-930.
- Tight, M. (2010). The curious case of case study: a viewpoint. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 13(4): 329-339.
- Tipples, R. and P. Gibbons. (1992). Garden visiting - Twentieth century local tourism in Canterbury. *Horticulture in New Zealand*, 3(2): 29-34.
- Tolich, M. (2004). Internal confidentiality: When confidentiality assurances fail relational informants. *Qualitative Sociology*, 27(1): 101-106.
- Torrance, H. (2012). Triangulation, respondent validation, and democratic participation in mixed methods research. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, XX(X): 1-13.
- Towner, J. (1996). *An historical geography of recreation and tourism in the western world: 1540-1940*. Chichester, John Wiley & Sons.
- Tracey, D. (2013). *Guerrilla gardening: a manual festo*. Gabriola Island, New Society Publishers.
- Tracy, J. L. and D. Matsumoto. (2008). The spontaneous display of pride and shame: Evidence for biologically innate nonverbal displays. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 105: 11655–11660.
- Tracy, J. L. and R. W. Robins. (2008). The nonverbal expression of pride: evidence for cross-cultural recognition. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 94(3): 516-530.
- Tracy, J. L., A. F. Shariff. and J. T. Cheng. (2010). A naturalist's view of pride. *Emotion Review*, 2(2): 163-177.
- Tuli, F. (2010). The basis of distinction between qualitative and quantitative research in social science: reflection on ontological, epistemological and methodological perspectives. *Ethiopian Journal of Education and Sciences*, 6(1): 97-108.
- Turner, T. (2005). *Garden history: philosophy and design 2000 BC-2000 AD*. Abingdon, Spon Press.
- Vachhani, S. J. and A. Pullen. (2011). Home is where the heart is? Organizing women's work and domesticity at Christmas. *Organization*, 18(6): 807-821.

- van der Duim, R. (2007). Tourismscapes an actor-network perspective. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 34(4): 961-976.
- van der Duim, R., C. Ren., and G. T. Jóhannesson. (2013). Ordering, materiality and multiplicity: Enacting ANT in Tourism. *Tourist Studies*, 13(1): 3-20.
- van der Toorn, J., M. Feinberg., J. T. Jost., A. C. Kay., T. R. Tyler., R. Willer. and C. Wilmuth. (2014). A sense of powerlessness fosters system justification: Implications for the legitimation of authority, hierarchy, and government. *Political psychology*, 36(1): 93-110.
- van Erp-Houtepen, A. (1986). The etymological origin of the garden. *The Journal of Garden History*, 6(3): 227-231.
- von Wright, G. H. (1971). *Explanation and Understanding*. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Veblen, T. (1889). *The Theory of the Leisure Class* [Dover Thrift Editions]. New York, Dover Publications.
- Walliman, N. (2006). *Social research methods*. London, SAGE Publications
- Weber, M. (1930). *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, T, Parsons. (trans.). London, Routledge.
- Weber, M. (1947). *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*. London, William Hodge.
- Weber, M. (1968). *Economy and society: an outline of interpretive sociology*. New York, Bedminster Press.
- Weinstock, D. (2011). Beyond Objective and Subjective: Assessing the Legitimacy of Religious Claims to Accommodation. *Les ateliers de l'éthique/The Ethics Forum*, 6(2): 155-175.
- Weissblum, E. N. (2012). *Do it because I said so... please?: The connection between supervisor interpersonal justice, perceived power, and employee reactions*. PhD thesis, State University of New York at Albany.
- Weller, S. C. and A. K. Romney. (1988). *Systematic data collection*. London, SAGE Publications.
- Wiebenson, D. (1978). *The picturesque garden in France*. Princeton, Princeton University Press
- Wilber, D. (1979). *Persian gardens and garden pavilions*. Washington, D.C., Dumbarton Oaks
- Wiles, R. (2013). *What are Qualitative Research Ethics?*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Wiles, R., J. Prosser., A. Bagnoli., A. Clark., K. Davies., S. Holland. and E. Renold. (2008). *Visual ethics: Ethical issues in visual research* (ESRC National Centre for Research Methods Review Paper). Unpublished online source,

- Wilkinson, A. (1998). *The garden in ancient Egypt*. London, Rubicon Press.
- Williams, G. (1984). The genesis of chronic illness: narrative re-construction. *Sociology of health & illness*, 6(2): 175-200.
- Williams, J. A., F. J. DeMicco. and E. L. Shafer. (2001). Derailment: Impending Dilemma for Management. *Hospitality Review*, 19(2): 60-72.
- Williams, M. (2002). Generalization in interpretive research. In T. May. (Ed.) *Qualitative research in action*. London, SAGE Publications: 125-143.
- Wisker, G. (2012). *The good supervisor: supervising postgraduate and undergraduate research for doctoral theses and dissertations*. New York, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wrong, D. H. (2002). *Power: Its forms, bases, and uses*. New Brunswick, Transaction Publishers.
- Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods*. London, SAGE Publications.
- Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case study research: Design and methods*. London, SAGE Publications.
- Young, R. A. and A. Collin. (2004). Introduction: Constructivism and social constructionism in the career field. *Journal of Vocational Behavior Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 64(3): 373-388.

Appendices

Appendix 1: False information on the introduction of additional charity nominated by garden openers in the website of Scotland's Gardens



POST WAR

Despite the neglect that most gardens suffered during the war years many continued to open for Scotland's Gardens and the numbers gradually increased.

With the creation of the National Health Scheme in 1948 the needs of the Queen's Nurses for funding was reduced and in 1952 it was decided that The Gardens Fund of The National Trust for Scotland, founded in the same year as Scotland's Gardens, should be adopted as a second beneficiary.

In 1961 an important decision was taken to allow the garden owners, if they chose, to allocate 40% of the gross takings from an opening to a registered charity of their choice. At the same time it was agreed to make small annual donations to The Royal Gardeners' Benevolent Fund and The Royal Gardeners' Orphan Fund, now Perennial.

In 1982 Scotland's Gardens won the British Tourist Authority's award for "Outstanding Contribution to Tourism".



<http://www.scotlandsgardens.org/aboutus> (Accessed on August 4th 2015)

Appendix 2: Information on the introduction of additional charity nominated by garden openers in a report for Queen's Institute Council Meeting held in 1953

SCOTLAND'S GARDENS SCHEME.

REPORT FOR QUEEN'S INSTITUTE COUNCIL MEETING.

Friday October 30th 1953.

It is difficult to give Council a report this year as the Gardens Scheme books are still in the hands of the Auditor, and it would not be wise to quote figures before having an audited statement. However, I can say that there have been 271 gardens in the Scheme this year, as compared with 253 last year, in spite of a falling off in the North-East as a result of the January storms, and a distinct decrease in activity over the Coronation season.

As a result the Scheme does show a rise this year, though it is not spectacular.

Perthshire is to be congratulated on having the largest number of gardens open for the Scheme - 18, followed by Berwickshire with 17, Kirkcudbrightshire and Roxburghshire with 16, and Dumfriesshire with 15. Although Peeblesshire has not quite so many garden openings, Mrs. Balfour seems to have a way of collecting a large number of donations, to produce a substantial return for the County.

We have had a most generous contribution of £250 from Her Majesty as a result of the garden openings at Balmoral.

1952 and 1953 have been an experiment. In 1951 we agreed, after consultation with the Garden Owners and Organisers, to return to the old idea when the Scheme did so well, of leaving/

Appendix 3: Information on the introduction of additional charity nominated by garden openers in a guidebook for 1955

SCOTLAND'S GARDENS SCHEME, 1955

Scotland's Gardens Scheme has been organised each year since 1931. Since then it has raised £249,236. Last year it raised £9,932. In 1952 an arrangement was entered into with the National Trust for Scotland who were anxious to raise money for the preservation of certain gardens of historic and national importance.

In 1955 the money raised will be divided as follows:—

60 per cent. to Headquarters from which, after deduction of Headquarters' expenses, two-thirds will* be allocated to the Scottish Queen's Nurses' Benevolent and Educational Funds and one-third to the Gardens Fund of the National Trust for Scotland.

The remaining 40 per cent. from each Garden opening (less County expenses) will be allocated to any recognised charity of the owner's choice. The name of the Charity is given under the garden entry in the Handbook of Gardens open to the Public. **It is hoped that Owners will contribute further to the Queen's Institute and to the Gardens Fund of the National Trust for Scotland from this 40 per cent. share, as Funds are urgently required to forward the aims of both these bodies.**

These Funds receive no assistance from the Government.

Appendix 4: Example of jotting down

Summerville

Cafe started friends suggestion propagating plants.

owner

antique shelf

books

fireplace

3:02

shelf

one

York

Uni prof. (Buddhism)

wife

garden lover

sister

Deon

don't open but have garden → not interesting small

We ppl tend to open year by year (reputation).

prof. garden visiting is like religion

Appendix 5: Examples of annotated fieldnotes

When I was amazed at the breath-taking scenery, a middle age woman wearing a green down jacket talked to me. I can't remember what she said but she didn't introduce herself. So I asked her "Do you own this place?..." Then she said **[yes]** and asked me if I was into a specific plant. I replied "I'm not so familiar with horticulture but I'm actually researching the motivation for opening the garden to the public. She replied "Oh, interesting! Motivation... well, I want to share this place with other people".

 **SHIMOYAMADA Sho**
Garden opener

I then went to a marquee where refreshments were served. I greeted two women who were doing the catering, and ordered a cup of coffee. I was almost sure I didn't need to pay because I was told by a helper that catering is included in the £7 fee that I paid at the entrance, but I asked 'How much?' in order to start a conversation with them. Of course they told me that it's included in the entrance fee. I further asked whether they live nearby. One of them said that she used to but moved out some time ago. **[I just help out... and I eat!]**, she said with a laugh, pointing at the cakes.

 **SHIMOYAMADA Sho**
Helper

After the conversation with the garden opener, I started sketching a bird's-eye view of the garden. While I was doing this, a middle-age woman spoke to me with a smile. "Are you an artist?" I smiled and said "No. I'm actually researching the motivation for opening the garden to the public". She replied "Oh, **[it's]** interesting! Because I ask people to open their gardens to the public". Then I asked "Are you from Scotland's Gardens?..." She said **[yes]** and briefly explained her job as a volunteer.

 **SHIMOYAMADA Sho**
Volunteer

Research information sheet

An ethnographic inquiry into the motivation and meaning of Open Gardens in Britain

Sho Shimoyamada

What is this research about?

The purpose of this study is to understand the motivation and meaning of Open Gardens. In order to achieve this, I would like you to be interviewed and to share some of your insights with me. The interview will be audio recorded. However, this is not the case if you do not agree.

Who is the researcher?

I am a PhD student at University of Edinburgh. I have been interested in a variety of leisure phenomena. British Open Gardens have particularly drawn my attention since there is no such activity in Japan (where I am from).

How will the interview data be used?

All recorded interviews will be transcribed. I will not reveal any information from the interviews to people outside the research so that confidentiality will be guaranteed. Information from interviews will be anonymously referred in my research works. The electronic data will be kept in my memory stick and password protected.

Are the respondents forced to take part in the research?

No. Your engagement is completely voluntary basis. You are entitled to leave the interview at any stage for whatever reason.


Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have questions.

Contact

Sho Shimoyamada
PhD candidate
Moray House School of Education
University of Edinburgh
Thomson's Land, Holyrood Road
Edinburgh, EH8 8AQ
S.Shimoyamada@sms.ed.ac.uk



Appendix 7: Research information sheet and interview consent form

Research information sheet		
An ethnographic enquiry into the motivation and meaning of Open Gardens in Britain		
Sho Shimoyamada		
<i>What is this research about?</i>		
The purpose of this study is to understand the motivation and meaning of Open Gardens. In order to achieve this, I would like you to be interviewed and to share some of your insights with me. The interview will be audio recorded. However, this is not the case if you do not agree.		
<i>Who is the researcher?</i>		
I am a PhD student at University of Edinburgh. I have been interested in a variety of leisure phenomena. British Open Gardens have particularly drawn my attention since there is no such activity in Japan (where I am from).		
<i>How will the interview data be used?</i>		
All recorded interviews will be transcribed. I will not reveal any information from the interviews to people outside the research so that confidentiality will be guaranteed. Information from interviews will be anonymously referred in my research works. The electronic data will be kept in my memory stick and password protected.		
<i>Are the respondents forced to take part in the research?</i>		
No. Your engagement is completely voluntary basis. You are entitled to leave the interview at any stage for whatever reason.		
Interview Consent		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• I understand that participating in the research includes being interviewed and audio recorded.• I understand that all recorded interviews will be transcribed.• I understand how confidentiality and anonymity will be guaranteed.• I understand that I can withdraw from the research whenever I want to.		
Participant signature:	_____	Date:
Researcher signature:	_____	Date:
Thank you very much for your participation. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.		Contact Sho Shimoyamada PhD candidate Moray House School of Education University of Edinburgh Thomson's Land, Holyrood Road Edinburgh, EH8 8AQ S.Shimoyamada@ed.ac.uk
Once again, I appreciate your co-operation.		

Request for your perspective

Dear [],

My name is Sho Shimoyamada, a Japanese PhD student of Edinburgh University. Please excuse for contacting you suddenly. I am currently researching into the motivation and meaning of Open Gardens for Scotland's Gardens (Please read another document for further information). My main focus is garden openers but I'm also investigating district organiser's views. Therefore, I wonder if I could interview you [on the phone]. If you agree to participate in my research, please contact me using the email address below. [I prefer to talk to you face to face [as I'd like to see your garden], but I can also do that on the phone if you want.] I promise that I will try to fit in with your schedule, and your privacy will be protected. It would be helpful if you could spend [] minutes on my interview.

Yours sincerely,

Sho

Sho Shimoyamada
PhD candidate
Moray House School of Education
University of Edinburgh
S.Shimoyamada@sms.ed.ac.uk



Appendix 9: Domain analysis [People in the co-production of Open Gardens]

Garden opener		
Helper	Not employed by garden openers	Family members
		Friends
		People from beneficiaries
		Employed gardener's relatives
	Employed by garden openers	Employed gardeners
		Housekeepers
Volunteer	Local committee	District Organisers
		Area Organisers
		Treasurers
	Trustee	Chairman
		Deputy Chairman
		Honorary Treasurers
Other members		
Scotland's Gardens	Chief Executive	
	Administrators	

Appendix 10: Domain analysis [Responsibilities of co-producers]

Garden opener	Pre-open day	Development and maintenance of garden	
		Recruitment of helpers	
		Preparation for catering	
		Preparation for plant sale	
	Open day	Socialising with visitors	
		Pleasing helpers	
Helper	Entrance administration		
	Catering		
	Plant sale		
	Traffic control		
Volunteer	District/Area organiser	Recruitment of prospective openers	
		Examination of garden quality	Observance of regulations
			Lenient judgement
			Different realities of the minute rule
		Comparison with NGS	
Treasurer	District's finances		
Scotland's Gardens	Distribution of money		
	Annual General Meeting		
	Other administrative duties		

Appendix 11: Domain analysis [Shared responsibilities of co-producers]

Garden openers and volunteer organisers	Arrangement of open day
Volunteers and Scotland's Gardens	Recruitment of volunteers
	Social gathering in districts
Garden openers, helpers and Scotland's Gardens	Security management
Scotland's Gardens, volunteers and garden openers	Publicity

Appendix 12: Domain analysis [The motivation for opening the garden to the public]

Show	Showing horticultural achievement		
	Showing ideas to others		
	Showing other objects		
	Impact of open days on garden maintenance	Open Garden as a driving force	
		No impact of Open Garden on garden maintenance	
	Attitudes towards showing (off)	Frankness about showing (off)	
		Hesitancy about showing (off)	
	Underlying feelings relevant to showing	Possession of confidence in the garden	
		Desire for rewards	
		Need to have others seeing the garden	
Lack of confidence in the garden			
Sharing	Sharing the garden with others as a responsibility		
	Sharing psychological benefits with others		
Provision of 40% of profits to charities nominated by garden openers	The 40% charity in which garden openers participate		
	The 40% charity in which helpers participate		
	The 40% charity close to garden opener's heart		
	Provision of the 40% to a wide range of charities		
Preference of with whom garden openers socialise	Preference for gardening enthusiast over novice		
	Preference for friends/acquaintances over strangers		

Appendix 13: Domain analysis [The de-motivation for opening the garden to the public]

Pre-open day	Request for friend's help
	Preparation for visitor attractions
	Ageing
Open day	Intrusion
	Competitiveness

Appendix 14: Codes [People in the production of Open Gardens]

Label	Garden opener (GO)
Definition/ description	Those who open their private gardens to the public under the auspices of Scotland's Gardens. Garden Openers do not necessarily hold the ownership of the garden. Those who have a close relationship with the owner such as sons (in-law) or daughters (in-law) can be regarded as Garden Openers in the case where they take a main responsibility for the orchestration of Open Gardens. One might find the term 'Garden Opener' awkward for aesthetic reasons, but it is more precise to call them so to differentiate them from garden owners. It was possible to detect who plays the locus role in Open Gardens, but it was unrealistic to rigorously check who owns the garden by requesting owner-ish people for legal documents that certify their ownerships.
Indicator	Wearing a badge or name tag. Talking to visitors. Being surrounded by visitors. Requesting helpers to perform tasks.
Example	Viewing the scenery, a middle-aged woman wearing a green down jacket talked to me. I can't remember what she said but she didn't introduce herself. So I asked her "Do you own this place?". Then she said yes. [Extracted fieldnote, Sally's garden]
Exception	Garden openers are not necessarily identical to garden owners.

Label	Helper (HEL)
Definition/ description	Those who help garden openers with the smooth and successful running of Open Gardens, mostly on public open days. Most of the helpers are family members or friends of openers', but people from beneficiaries occasionally work in the gardens as helpers. Helpers' typical responsibilities are entrance administration, plant sales and provision of refreshments in the gardens.
Indicator	Presence at entrance, plant stalls or places where refreshments are served.
Example	I paid three pounds entrance fee at the reception and got inside the garden. There was a middle age man at the reception, collecting money from the visitors. [Extracted fieldnote, Celia and Julius' garden]
Exception	Even though volunteers are occasionally present in Open Gardens, they are differentiated from helpers.

Label	Volunteers (VOL)
Definition/ description	Those who voluntarily work for Scotland's Gardens as District Organisers, Area Organisers, Treasurers or Trustee members. The most important figure is District Organisers because they have a variety of responsibilities such as the nomination of new gardens, inspection of garden quality or distribution of marketing materials.
Indicator	Since the name and contact details of volunteers are shown in the guidebook and local brochure, it was straightforward to identify existing volunteers. However, sometimes newly appointed volunteers whose names and contacts were not shown in the sources were identified in the fieldwork.
Example	Interviewer: Do you know anyone from Scotland's Gardens? Do you know any... volunteer, District Organiser? Cordelia: We are. {I: really?} Yes. [Extracted interview transcript, helpers called Martin and Cordelia]
Exception	Volunteers are distinguished from paid workers or Scotland's Gardens because the former are not salaried.

Label	Scotland's Gardens (SG)
Definition/ description	The charitable organisation that runs Open Gardens all over Scotland. Those who work in the organisation are also collectively called Scotland's Gardens where appropriate.
Indicator	Scotland's Gardens is the only organisation that runs Open Gardens all over Scotland. The workers of the organisation are shown in the guidebook and website. Therefore, it is not difficult to identify them. However, their identity would be characterised by the fact that they are paid workers.
Example	Hilary: It (the Open Garden) has to be run as a business, otherwise we couldn't survive. [Extracted interview transcript, SG's administrator called Hilary]
Exception	The staff of Scotland's Gardens is distinguished from volunteers because the former is salaried.

Appendix 15: Code [Development and maintenance of gardens]

Label	DMG
Definition/ description	Garden opener's responsibility to make the garden up to scratch. Since visitors are charged for entrance to the garden, it has to be good enough to satisfy their expectations otherwise the head office of Scotland's Gardens might receive complaints afterwards. DMG is occasionally performed in co-operation with helpers in cases where there are employed gardeners.
Indicator	References to gardening practices done beforehand
Example	Angela: Yes. And I mean that... well, like, take the example of the gravel. You know what gravel is? Interviewer: Sorry, I'm afraid I don't know. Angela: gravel is sort of stones. Not this (pointed out stone tiles

	covering the ground). This is paving. Gravel is loose stones, is what the paths are made of ... It's a quite big operation. And it's easy to put that off. Easy not to do that. But of course it's to do that to finish off the garden. That makes, to me, a quite big difference. If I weren't going to be opening it, I probably wouldn't do it. I would do that in expectation of people coming to see the garden. [Extracted interview transcript, garden opener called Angela]
Exception	DMG is differentiated from the general garden maintenance that is performed on a day-to-day basis. It is crucial that garden openers tend their gardens specifically for Open Gardens under Scotland's Gardens. This sometimes provokes worries or anxiety about open day and visitors coming to see the garden.

Appendix 16: Code [Recruitment of helpers]

Label	RH
Definition/ description	Garden opener's responsibility to find, if necessary, somebody who can help them with opening. Helpers tend to be family members or friends. In situations where garden openers struggle to find helpers, they occasionally ask people from beneficiaries for which 40% of profits made in their Open Gardens is raised. Whilst RH is usually performed by garden openers, there was also a case where a helper called another helper. Helpers tend to help Open Gardens repeatedly, and take their participation in the production of Open Gardens for granted. Hence some openers do not need to persuade them to come around.
Indicator	Presence of helpers observed in the garden. References to ways in which an opener managed to get helpers.
Example	Angela: They're my friends. But I employ, here I employ two ladies. They help me out. But I have to pay them. I don't expect them to do it for free. [Extracted interview transcript, garden opener called Angela]
Exception	Do not confuse RH with the act of encouraging commercial people to sell plant cuttings, jams or other products in Open Gardens. The commercial sellers are fundamentally different from helpers. They have to pay for the right to sell their products in the gardens, but helpers of course do not.

Appendix 17: Code [Preparation for catering]

Label	PC
Definition/ description	Garden opener's responsibility to prepare the refreshments served in Open Gardens. This is occasionally performed in co-operation with helpers.
Indicator	References to ways of securing refreshments. For example, baking done beforehand.
Example	Nancy: On rainy days, I'll bake, and I put it in a freezer. So it's already done.

	[Extracted interview transcript, helper called Nancy]
Exception	PC is differentiated from sales of refreshments in Open Gardens (Appendix 22).

Appendix 18: Code [Preparation for plant sale]

Label	PPS
Definition/ description	Garden opener's responsibility to prepare for plant sales in Open Gardens. This is occasionally performed in co-operation with helpers. Garden openers do not necessarily grow plants sold in their Open Gardens, and can buy them from nurseries or commercial garden centres.
Indicator	Remarks on the ways in which garden openers or helpers secure plants sold in Open Gardens.
Example	Geraldine: And I know that some people get a garden centre to provide plants... And it's like having a garden centre in the back cause I've got loads of pots. And we keep them down at the back of the house there. And they have to be watered and looked after and so it is an added chore. [Extracted interview transcript, garden opener called Geraldine]
Exception	PPS is different from permitting nurseries or commercial garden centres to sell plants in Open Gardens. They have to pay for the permission to sell plants in Open Gardens, but the garden openers of course do not need to pay for plant sales in their own Open Gardens.

Appendix 19: Code [Socialising with visitors]

Label	SV
Definition/ description	Garden opener's responsibility to talk to and thank visitors or to answer their questions. The extent to which an opener feels responsible for SV varies on the case-by-case basis (Some do not even show up).
Indicator	Conversations between garden openers and visitors observed in fieldwork. References to interactions between them.
Example	Viewing the scenery, a middle-aged woman wearing a green down jacket talked to me. I can't remember what she said but she didn't introduce herself. So I asked her "Do you own this place?". Then she said yes. [Extracted fieldnote, Sylvia's garden]
Exception	Some helpers are also keen to talk to visitors, but this is differentiated from SV because helpers would not need to express gratitude to visitors.

Appendix 20: Code [Pleasing helpers]

Label	PH
Definition/ description	It is garden opener's responsibility to thank and satisfy helpers. The degree to which an opener feels responsible for PH varies on a case by case basis. The ways in which openers perform PH vary, but feeding helpers is a common way. Since food is a driving force for some helpers' agreement to work in Open Gardens, PH is sometimes intertwined with the recruitment of helpers.
Indicator	References to a variety of ways in which an opener expresses gratitude to helpers.
Example	Leanna: And then at the end of all, I fed everybody. I was having a big dinner party for 12 people... It was a huge effort, and expensive! You know? [Extracted interview transcript, garden opener called Leanna]
Exception	PH needs to be clearly differentiated from District/Area Organiser's practices to thank openers by sending post-opening letters.

Appendix 21: Code [Entrance administration]

Label	EA
Definition/ description	Helper's responsibility to handle visitor's entrance to the garden. This includes collection of entrance fees, provision of tickets, flyers or garden maps to visitors and explanation of ways to reach gardens or places where refreshments are served.
Indicator	Presence of helpers who collect entrance fee from, and sell tickets to, visitors. Provision of visual materials is sometimes included. References to these tasks.
Example	No one was there but there were an old lady and a girl looking at me from a distance. I greeted them. The girl approached me so I paid the £5 entrance fee. She gave me a yellow sticker. I picked up a copy of the local brochure and headed to the garden entrance. The lady talked to me, "You brought the sun! It's sunny!". It was getting sunny. "Did I?", I replied and asked if she owns the castle and the garden. She said no and the owner is in the castle at that moment. She told me to follow a yellow signboard to get to the garden. I got permission to take pictures. I thanked her and planned to talk to her later. [Extracted fieldnote, Pauwell's garden]
Exception	Even though it is possible in some Open Gardens to pay for refreshments at the entrance, EA should not be confused with the catering service (Appendix 22) because its essential aim is to handle visitor's entry to the garden.

Appendix 22: Code [Catering]

Label	CAT
Definition/description	Helper's responsibility to serve refreshments, collect money paid by visitors and give them change if necessary. There are waiters and waitresses in some big Open Gardens.
Indicator	Presence of helpers taking visitor's orders, serving teas or coffees or washing up. References to these practices.
Example	I then went to a place where refreshments were served for free. It was a marquee, not a summer house or conservatory. I ordered a cup of coffee at a desk where two female helpers were working. I was almost sure I didn't need to pay but asked how much in order to start a conversation with them. Of course they said it's included in the entrance fee. [Extracted fieldnote, Gardeners in Glasgow]
Exception	CAT is distinguished from the preparation for catering (Appendix 18) because the latter is usually done beforehand whereas CAT is a task performed on open days.

Appendix 23: Code [Plant sale]

Label	PS
Definition/description	Helper's responsibility to sell plants in Open Gardens.
Indicator	Presence of helpers selling plants in Open Gardens. References to plant sales.
Example	I went back to the castle entrance. The woman who talked to me when I came in was selling plants there. She was chatting with some other visitors. I approached her, and started looking at the plants, waiting for a chance to chat with her. Numerous pots were placed on the ground, so visitors there all looked down. After a while, she became available and talked to me. [Extracted fieldnote, Pauwell's garden]
Exception	PS must be differentiated from commercial nursery's practices that sell commercial plants. Unlike the latter, profit gained from PS is raised for charity and helpers who are responsible for PS do not pay for a space.

Appendix 24: Code [Traffic control]

Label	TC
Definition/description	Helper's responsibility to control traffic in the parking lot or other places where necessary.
Indicator	Presence of helpers who guide cars or limit the entry of cars outside the gardens. References to these acts.
Example	Numerous cars were parked in a large parking lot in front of the house. There was a woman who guided cars entering there to available parking spaces.

	[Extracted fieldnote, Shiela's garden]
Exception	TC is a task performed by helpers. Garden owners often put the 'car parking this way' signboards in order to effectively guide visitors with cars, but this is differentiated from TC.

Appendix 25: Code [Recruitment of prospective openers]

Label	RPO
Definition/ description	District or Area Organiser's responsibility to ask those with nice gardens to open them for Scotland's gardens. This is crucial as the underlying objective of the organisation is to raise as much money for donation as possible.
Indicator	References to the ways in which organisers find gardens of good standard and ask their owners to open, shortages in the number of Open Gardens in their districts or necessities of increasing the number of Open Gardens.
Example	First of all, I decided to sketch a bird's-eye view of the garden. While I was doing this, a middle-age woman spoke to me with a slight laugh. "Are you an artist?" I smiled and said "No. I'm actually researching into the motivation for open garden". She replied "Oh, it's interesting! Because I ask people to open their gardens to the public!". Then I asked "Are you from Scotland's Gardens?". She said 'yes' and briefly explained her job as a volunteer. [Extracted fieldnote, Sally's garden]
Exception	RPO is differentiated from the examination of garden quality (Appendix 26) because the former applies to situations where Scotland's Gardens approaches those who own nice gardens.

Appendix 26: Code [Examination of garden quality]

Label	EGQ
Definition/ description	District and Area Organiser's responsibility to examine the garden quality in accordance with Scotland's Gardens' selection criteria. This is important because if the garden is not satisfactory, the head office of Scotland's Gardens might get complaints from visitors afterwards. However, in practice, the strictness of their judgement varies on a case-by-case basis.
Indicator	References to the ways in which an organiser checks the garden. Episodes of refusing somebody who is willing to open or hesitation in refusing.
Example	Sylvia: Yes, there are criteria for opening for Scotland's Gardens. [Extracted interview transcript, Area Organiser called Sylvia] Jennet: And head office had a complaint about the garden in the villages, village garden. And I was asked to go the... yes, I didn't enjoy that, go with the Area Organiser. They had to tell (them) that the gardens weren't... up-to-standard. And before they opened

	again, they would have to do something about it. [Extracted interview transcript, Area Organiser called Jennet]
Exception	EGQ is differentiated from the recruitment of prospective openers (Appendix 25) because the former applies to situations where garden owners approach Scotland's Gardens.

Appendix 27: Code [Observance of the regulation]

Label	OR
Definition/ description	District or Area Organiser's fixed use of criteria or appropriate judgement on the garden quality in accordance with the internal rules of Scotland's Gardens.
Indicator	Experience of refusing garden owners willing to open or requiring them to make changes to the gardens.
Example	Interviewer: Have you ever said to someone, "No. You can't open your garden?" Barclay: Yes. Not often but once. Cos it wasn't up to standard. Interviewer: Did you require that person to make changes to the garden? Barclay: No . It wasn't really... the garden wouldn't be suitable anyway. [Extracted interview transcript, District Organiser called Barclay]
Exception	Do not confuse this with visitor's strict opinion on the garden quality.

Appendix 28: Code [Lenient judgement]

Label	LJ
Definition/ description	District or Area organiser's flexible use of criteria or less strict judgement on the garden quality.
Indicator	Relaxed attitudes towards the necessity to inspect gardens. Consideration of the number of Open Gardens in a sparsely populated region of which an organiser is in charge.
Example	Maureen: No, no! I'm not going to inspect... inspection, I think, is a strong word. It's used in England... What we do is to encourage people to open. [Extracted interview transcript, Area Organiser called Maureen]
Exception	Do not confuse this with visitor's complimentary opinion on the garden quality

Appendix 29: Code [Different realities of the minute rule]

Label	DRMR
Definition/ description	The difference in people's belief about the length of time that an Open Garden has to keep the visitor's horticultural interest. The official guideline for District Organisers who are responsible for the examination of garden quality does not tell how long an Open

	Garden is expected to keep the interest of visitors. Therefore, the existence of such a minute rule itself is subject to doubt.
Indicator	Remarks on the specific length of time that an Open Garden has to hold the visitor's horticultural interest.
Example	Martin: The attention or interest for... about 40 or 45 minutes. But you could of course have two gardens of 20 minutes each. If they are open, could be next door each other. So two very small ones. So collectively for one piece of money you are getting 40 minutes, but they happen to be in two different gardens. But it's... that sort of amount of time. [Extracted interview transcript, prospective Area Organiser called Martin]
Exception	Unlike SG, the NGS does instruct garden openers to sustain a certain length of visitor attention, but do not presume that this applies to SG.

Appendix 30: Code [Comparison with NGS]

Label	CNGS
Definition/ description	Remarks on NGS and its renowned strict judgement on the garden quality in order to indicate the lenient judgement of Scotland's Gardens or garden opener's autonomy for the garden development.
Indicator	Mentions of watching TV programmes on the NGS.
Example	Geraldine: Certainly, it's much more competitive in England. There was a television programme last year, I think, about the NGS. The organisers are coming and telling that they have to do that and do that in the garden to get in the book. Personally, I would not do like that at all. I just would've said, I'm not going to be in that because otherwise how can it be your..., your choice? Someone's telling you put up the pergola here or if you do this here. That's not... no, I couldn't be like that. I'm much more independent. [Extracted interview transcript, garden opener called Geraldine]
Exception	CNGS is not an objective proof that NGS is definitely stricter at the garden selection than SG is. CNGS only reflects the belief and subjectivity of those involved in the co-production of Scottish Open Gardens.

Appendix 31: Code [District's finance]

Label	DF
Definition/ description	Treasurer's responsibility to deal with the finance of their districts. This includes creating charity rules for consistent performances of their tasks, archiving charity records and verifying the records. They have to process these in accordance with charity regulations of Scotland and the UK.
Indicator	Treasurer's oral explanation of their duties.
Example	Sylvia: So anybody who opens their garden has to... the money has

	to go through the... charity books. I then have to issue in a cheque to the garden owner's charity of choice. They have to sign a receipt form. Specific orders have to be carried out to fit in with all charity rules in Scotland and in the UK. [Extracted interview transcript, treasurer called Sylvia]
Exception	DF is differentiated from the finance of the head office

Appendix 32: Code [Distribution of money]

Label	DM
Definition/ description	SG's responsibility to raise profits made by Open Gardens for registered beneficiaries and other charities nominated by garden openers.
Indicator	The report of the amount of money raised for charities. It is given to garden openers at their Annual General Meetings. Introduction of registered beneficiaries in the guidebook and website.
Example	Fennella: the nice thing is about... we have our own charities but the owner gets to decide where 40% of the money will go. [Extracted interview transcript, SG's administrator called Fennella]
Exception	DM is different from the general accounting work.

Appendix 33: Code [Annual General Meeting]

Label	AGM
Definition/ description	SG's responsibility to hold AGMs in Edinburgh
Indicator	Remarks on AGM.
Example	Fennella: Yeah, the annual general meeting and conference that we have every April. We invite all the volunteers, all the garden owners and we have a huge thing at the Edinburgh International Conference Centre. [Extracted interview transcript, SG's administrator called Fennella]
Exception	AGM is different from other regional meetings or gatherings held in each district (Appendix 37).

Appendix 34: Code [Other administrative duties]

Label	OAD
Definition/ description	Daily tasks that paid workers of SG perform. This includes accounting work, taking minutes, keeping the database up-to-date, etc.
Indicator	Remarks on their day-to-day duties.
Example	Hilary: I do some accounts work. I do some, I organise PayPal. I organise posters or.... But I think my main job is dealing with the organisers and the garden owners. If they've got a problem, they come to me and they speak to me. We have a database. I have to keep the database up-to-date. If when the garden information

	comes in, I'm responsible for checking, I'm responsible for keeping the contact lists, so that they are correct. I also take minutes, and type up minutes. I can also be making tea for people that come to the office. [Extracted interview transcript, SG's administrator called Hilary]
Exception	For the reason that OAD refers to all the tasks performed by paid workers of SG except for DM (Appendix 32) and AGM (Appendix 33), it does not have any other exceptions.

Appendix 35: Code [Arrangement of opening dates]

Label	AOD
Definition/ description	Garden opener and volunteer's joint responsibility to decide when to open. In the case where the day on which an opener wants to open coincides with the request of other openers in the same area, persuasion or negotiation is required. AOD is also influenced by the weather conditions.
Indicator	References to the date which one chooses or on which hopes to open, and the rationale behind it.
Example	Amelia: So there are roses that want to flower. Flower only in July, for that month. And that's the time we open [Extracted interview transcript, garden opener called Amelia] Joceline: One of the people who is powerful in my area is a very wealthy landowner that opens their garden every year... I have to say, "That's fine" (Laugh) because we need to open, because this garden is a beautiful beautiful garden... So I just have to say, "Okay". So I suppose these people who are very wealthy with very big gardens have very important money spent in Scotland's Gardens. [Extracted interview transcript, District Organiser called Joceline]
Exception	Whilst District or Area Organisers sometimes persuade garden owners to change the dates they originally chose, AOD is clearly different from the recruitment of prospective garden openers (Appendix 25). This is because AOD is a posterior task, and the need of AOD does not arise unless there are garden owners who agree to open.

Appendix 36: Code [Recruitment of volunteers]

Label	RV
Definition/ description	SG and volunteers' joint responsibility to find and select new volunteers. Commonly, new volunteers are appointed through word-of-mouth recommendations.
Indicator	Episodes of how volunteers were appointed and joined a local committee.
Example	Paton: All we do is through word-of-mouth. We do it through volunteer websites. We do it sometimes by advertising. But it's

	<p>mostly word-of-mouth. [Extracted interview transcript, Chief Executive called Paton]</p> <p>Jennet: Well, I was invited by the previous Area Organiser... before [the current District Organiser]. [Extracted interview transcript, Area Organiser called Jennet]</p>
Exception	Some volunteers open their gardens to the public, but RV is differentiated from the recruitment of prospective garden openers (Appendix 25).

Appendix 37: Code [Social gathering in districts]

Label	SGD
Definition/ description	SG and volunteers' joint responsibility to organise a social gathering. The former explain what the organisation operates to people in local committees and garden openers. The latter, especially District Organiser, host the gatherings at their homes or others' houses appropriate for that purpose. This is a precious opportunity for SG's paid workers to meet and talk to garden openers face to face.
Indicator	Episodes of lunch meetings or any kinds of gathering held before or regularly.
Example	<p>Hilary: We started a new thing, where we have gone out to... instead of district or our region, so that's maybe three or four districts come together. And we meet at someone's house. Some of the... more affluent people have big houses. We meet there and we go through generally just explain what we do in the office... But each district now have been visited once. And the thing we are going to do is, we're going to start a pick-in. Because we want to go round the regions... at least once in 18 months. So this is a new thing. [Extracted interview transcript, administrator called Hilary]</p> <p>Leanna: We've been invited to [District Organiser]'s house, near [name of locality] for a drinks party, in April. Just a couple of hours, but then you met all the other garden owners within [name of locality]. So that was quite good. [Extracted interview transcript, garden opener called Leanna]</p>
Exception	SGD is different from organising AGMs (Appendix 33).

Appendix 38: Code [Security management]

Label	SM
Definition/ description	SG and garden opener's joint responsibility to have countermeasures against intrusion, theft or vandalism. Scotland's Gardens takes out liability insurance for such undesirable scenarios, and advises garden openers to identify areas in which public access is prohibited, secure garden equipment in sheds, keep

	valuables out of sight and lock the house. Garden openers can request 'No Entry' signage and put it where appropriate. SM is sometimes performed in co-operation with helpers. For example, in situations where refreshments are served in kitchen or conservatory, it is necessary not to lock such private places. Therefore, the openers ask their helpers serving refreshments there to keep an eye on visitors.
Indicator	Description of liability insurance and other practical advice in information pack that SG gives new garden openers. References to actions taken to prevent the disturbances listed above from happening.
Example	Stephen: We had some 'No entry' signs and we made it quite clear that people aren't allowed to go. [Extracted interview transcript, helper called Stephen]
Exception	SM is countermeasures against potential harm, breakages or any other inconvenience caused on public open days, and hence is different from daily efforts that garden owners generally make to prevent theft, intrusion or damage to their gardens.

Appendix 39: Code [Publicity]

Label	PUB
Definition/ description	SG, volunteers and garden opener's joint responsibility to increase the profile of Open Gardens. Scotland's Gardens is responsible for publishing a guidebook, social media and newspaper adverts. Volunteers, particularly District Organisers, are responsible for the distribution of marketing materials such as banners, posters, flyers and local brochures. Garden Openers can request such materials, and then the organisers are commissioned by Scotland's Gardens to deliver the requested items to the gardens. The organisers are also required by SG to deliver some marketing materials to other places such as local notice boards or tourist information centres. Some District Organisers advertise Open Gardens in their own areas in local newspapers. Some garden openers also advertise their own Open Gardens in their personal SNS accounts.
Indicator	Remarks on the aforementioned tasks. Description of distribution of marketing materials in the Guidelines for District Organiser that SG gives newly appointed District Organisers.
Example	Nina: Sometimes I get annoyed with, not [a paid worker of Scotland's Gardens] cause she's lovely. But I do get annoyed with Head Office (of SG) because we get lots of leaflets, and lots of posters and phone calls, "Could you just go and put up this posters? And can you just go and put up ...?" And actually, no, I can't. [Extracted interview transcript, Area Organiser called Nina]
Exception	Whilst some garden openers have their own webpages and advertise their gardens, this is different from PUB because this is not for increasing the profile of Open Gardens under SG.

Appendix 40: Code [Showing (off) horticultural achievements]

Label	ShoHA
Definition/ description	A kind of motivation for opening the garden to the public where garden openers want to display what they have achieved in their gardens to others. If the degree of vanity or exhibitionism is high or if it's expressed in a conspicuous manner that others possibly find annoying, it might be appropriate to describe such ostentatious attention-seeking as 'showing off'.
Indicator	The use of terms such as 'show', 'display', 'exhibit' or 'show off'. The act of talking about horticultural awards he or she won before. In physical form, sometimes there are readings or visual materials that openers leave in their Open Gardens to let the visitors know about the gardens. This takes different forms such as map, flyer, book and picture.
Example	Angela: Because I want to show off... I do want other people to see it. [Extracted interview transcript, garden opener called Angela]
Exception	Do not confuse ShoHA with showing ideas to others (Appendix 41) and showing other objects to others (Appendix 42). There is a difference in the object of display.

Appendix 41: Code [Showing ideas to others]

Label	ShoI
Definition/ description	A kind of motivation for opening the garden to the public where garden openers want to show ideas behind their gardening practices to others.
Indicator	References to the term 'show' or 'display' and also to horticultural practices as objects of intended showing or displaying.
Example	Tracy warmly welcomed us. She is younger than [her friend who introduced me to her] and has great interest in growing vegetables. Tracy asked me what my research is about and then took us to her backyard garden where there were several tubs full of vegetables. She said she'd like to show people they can also grow vegetables, and growing vegetables is much easier than people think. [Extracted fieldnote, Gardeners in Helensburgh]
Exception	Whereas both ShoHA and ShoI are to show or display gardens to others, they are differentiated from each other because in ShoI there is no conceivable possession of confidence that underlies ShoHA. For more detailed explanation, see codes PCG (Appendix 47) and LCG (Appendix 50).

Appendix 42: Code [Showing other objects]

Label	ShoOO
Definition/ description	A kind of motivation for opening the garden to the public where garden openers want to show neither horticultural achievements

	nor ideas, but other things to others.
Indicator	It must be clear that an object that one wants to show others is neither horticultural achievement nor ideas, but something else, such as political messages. See the example below.
Example	Gary: The terrace has got a terrace association which has been growing since it was built in 1850s. And its function, initially, was to look after the communal property... And I was the chairman of that committee, committee of that association. And we were very concerned about... about people converting the back gardens into car parks. So one of the ways we thought about, in fact, to avoid this process, is to show people how important gardens were. [Extracted interview transcript, garden opener called Gary]
Exception	Do not include ShoHA and ShoI.

Appendix 43: Code [Sharing the garden with others as a responsibility]

Label	ShaGR
Definition/ description	A kind of motivation for opening the garden to the public where garden openers feel responsible for sharing their gardens with others, and tend to think of their gardens to be worth sharing.
Indicator	Any verbal expressions indicating that opening is a 'responsibility', 'obligation' or 'duty'.
Example	Pauwell: Well, the point is that this house is 500 years old. The garden is world-famous and you have to share that. So... we have people coming from all over the world to see the house and the garden and they pay for it. It is a very expensive hobby to run a house like this and the garden. So most people come here, pay for it. But we have a strong feeling that we have to share that. [Extracted interview transcript, garden opener called Pauwell]
Exception	ShaGR is differentiated from sharing psychological benefits with others (Appendix 44) because of the difference in the object of sharing. In addition, unlike sharing ideas with others, ShaGR shares certain aspects of <i>noblesse oblige</i> . One of the wealthy garden openers who expressed ShaGR remarked that she opens her garden for those who do not have a garden.

Appendix 44: Code [Sharing psychological benefits with others]

Label	SPBO
Definition/ description	A kind of motivation for opening the garden to the public where garden openers want to share psychological benefits gained from their gardens.
Indicator	Mentions of terms 'share' and any expressions that infer psychological benefits such as 'pleasure', 'enjoyment' or 'satisfaction'.
Example	Sylvia: I think that the key thing is, to share the common enjoyment, sharing ideas with people who enjoy the same thing. Sharing and interacting with people in a good way.

	<p>[Extracted interview transcript, garden opener called Sylvia]</p> <p>Kentaro: Those who have something special, not only gardens, but also an art collection for example, I think such people have a sort of feeling that they want to share a kind of pleasure obtained from owning them or seeing them every day.</p> <p>[Extracted interview transcript, garden opener called Kentaro]</p>
Exception	SPBO is differentiated from ShaGR for the same reason as the one described in Appendix 43.

Appendix 45: Code [Frankness about showing (off)]

Label	FS
Definition/description	Openness about the intention to show (off) the garden to others.
Indicator	Open remarks on horticultural achievements such as awards or prizes that he or she won before. Talking about the intention to display horticultural achievement before I ask.
Example	<p>Janet: I don't hide the fact that I like people coming and admiring the garden.</p> <p>[Extracted interview transcript, garden opener called Janet]</p>
Exception	Do not assume that all of the people who frankly mentioned the display of horticultural achievements think that their attitude is morally acceptable. For example, Angela, who clearly identified 'showing off her garden' as a primary reason, found her feeling boastful.

Appendix 46: Code [Hesitancy about showing]

Label	HS
Definition/description	Reluctance to express the interest in showing (off) their gardens or to explicitly express the intention to show (off) because they think it is not morally acceptable.
Indicator	Expressed modesty or the alienation from those who acknowledge the intention to show (off).
Example	<p>Janet: I don't think that I go out saying, 'Look at my garden. It's better than everybody else's.'</p> <p>[Extracted interview transcript, garden opener called Janet]</p>
Exception	It needs to be differentiated from the lack of confidence in the garden (Appendix 50) because the possession of confidence in the garden (Appendix 47) does not necessarily drive the possessor to show (off) their gardens to others.

Appendix 47: Code [Possession of confidence in the garden]

Label	PCG
Definition/description	Garden opener's possession of confidence in their gardens. This is a feeling that potentially underlies ShoHA.
Indicator	Positive comments on the quality of one's own garden.
Example	Angela: I do think it is worth coming to. [Extracted interview transcript, garden opener called Angela]
Exception	PCG is different from the complimentary opinions on someone else's garden.

Appendix 48: Code [Want of rewards]

Label	WR
Definition/description	Garden opener's want of reward in compensation for efforts they have put in their gardens. This is a feeling that potentially underlies ShoHA. The potential reward varies such as appreciation of plants by visitors, their complimentary comments on gardens, money, prize and socialising.
Indicator	References to previously-made commitments to the garden or any other expressions that indicates the amount of work or effort an opener has put in their garden.
Example	Angela: I feel quite heavy commitment to your... you are setting yourself up as ... a place which is worth people coming to... we do a lot of work on it. [Extracted interview transcript, garden opener called Angela]
Exception	Prizes and awards could be seen by garden openers as rewards, but need to be differentiated from WR in the case where these are the object of their display.

Appendix 49: Code [The necessity for other people to see their gardens]

Label	NOL
Definition/description	The view that gardens must be looked. NOL can be a theme that underlies ShoHA.
Indicator	An opinion that there is no point if garden is not looked at by other people.
Example	Jock: I think it's nice that other people appreciate it. I think it's a bit waste if I work just for me. [Extracted interview transcript, garden opener called Jock]
Exception	Many of the garden openers would like other people to have a look at their gardens, but strictly speaking, this is different from NOL because of its focus on the high degree of indispensability of other people looking at the garden. Garden openers who expressed NOL regarded open days as a necessary goal of their creations.

Appendix 50: Code [Lack of confidence in the garden]

Label	LCG
Definition/description	Garden opener's lack of confidence in their own gardens. LCG can be a reason why some garden openers do NOT want to show off their gardens to others.
Indicator	The lack of, or low degree of, confidence in the garden. Negative expressions on the unsatisfactory quality of one's own garden. Indirect excuse for the quality of the garden. Consider how garden openers started opening (passive vs active) and transition from the lack of confidence to the possession of confidence.
Example	Anita: No no. I'm always apprehensive that my garden is going to be up to scratch... When the Scottish Garden Scheme asked me to open, I said it will not be a weed-free garden.
Exception	Whilst LCG often underlies HS (Appendix 46), they are differentiated from each other because the latter focuses on the garden opener's moral dilemma.

Appendix 51: Code [The 40% charity in which openers participate]

Label	40-O
Definition/description	Donation of the 40% of gross profits made by an Open Garden to garden opener's own charity.
Indicator	Garden opener's status as a president of charitable body or trust.
Example	Kentaro as the president of his own art trust and his intention to raise money for the trust.
Exception	40-O is different from raising money for charity in which helpers participate (Appendix 52).

Appendix 52: Code [The 40% charity in which helpers participate]

Label	40-H
Definition/description	Donation of the 40% of gross profits made by an Open Garden to a charity in which helpers take part. It does not matter whether there is a friendship between an opener and helpers from the charity.
Indicator	Garden opener's mention of how helpers were recruited.
Example	Ally as a helper from the art centre to which Sylvia gave the 40%.
Exception	40-H is different from raising money for charity in which garden openers participate (Appendix 51).

Appendix 53: Code [The 40% charity close to opener's heart]

Label	40-COH
Definition/description	Donation of the 40% of profits made by an Open Garden to a charity to which a garden opener feels close. Besides, 40-COH is identified on the condition that neither a garden opener nor helpers participate in the charity.
Indicator	Garden opener's mention of charities to which the 40% is given,

	personal connection with it and emotional/sympathetic accounting for the selection of that charity.
Example	<p>Janet: 40 % goes to [name of locality] Cat Rescue.</p> <p>Interviewer: Why did you choose the cat charity?</p> <p>Janet: Like all charities, they need money. I like animals. I'm from a family where we all like animals very much. My father, my mother probably prefer... to her, family came first, then animals and then other people after that. And I kind of feel that way too. You know, to me animals are very important. I don't look on animals as an inferior species. You know, it's humans that say humans are the very clever one. But that's just our opinion. So my opinion is, you know, we are all equal really. Some animals do a lot of things better than we do. We have a brain certainly but a lot of animals too as well. You know, a good brain I mean. Not just a brain. So yes, animals are most important to me.</p> <p>[Extracted interview transcript, garden opener called Janet]</p>
Exception	40-COH is clearly distinguished from 40-O (Appendix 51) and 40-H (Appendix 52).

Appendix 54: Code [Provision of the 40% to a wide range of charities]

Label	40-WRC
Definition/description	Frequent change of charities to which 40% of profits made by an Open Garden in order to help as wide a range of people in need as possible.
Indicator	Garden opener's mentions of many different charities to which he or she has donated money through Open Gardens.
Example	<p>Cameron: We change the organisations each year.</p> <p>Interviewer: Each year?</p> <p>Cameron: Yeah.</p> <p>Interviewer: May I ask why?</p> <p>Cameron: Yes. Because I think it's a good thing to... move around, not always support one charity, but to move around to support a variety of charities. I might have repeated in five year times. We might still take care of Marys Meals again though. Might do the Lamp of [name of locality] again.</p> <p>[Extracted interview transcript, garden opener called Cameron]</p>
Exception	Even though some garden openers randomly nominate additional charities and give them 40% of profits for no reason, this is different from 40-WRC because garden openers with 40-WRC has a clear rationale behind it, supporting as wide a range of people as possible.

Appendix 55: Code [Preference for gardening enthusiasts over novices]

Label	PGE
Definition/description	Garden opener's preference for socialising with gardening enthusiasts over novices.

Indicator	Antipathy against, or unpleasantness about, cake eaters or other kinds of visitors whose primary interest is not in gardens.
Example	She (an ex-garden opener that I visited) frankly said that she didn't like the sort of people who are only eating in her garden. She prefers keen gardeners who ask lots of questions and visit her garden year by year to see the development. [Extracted fieldnote, Anne-Mary's garden]
Exception	Differentiate PGE from preference for friends/acquaintances over strangers (Appendix 56) because friends or acquaintances are not necessarily interested in horticulture.

Appendix 56: Code [Preference for friends/acquaintances over strangers]

Label	PFA
Definition/ description	Garden opener's preference for socialising with friends or acquaintances over strangers.
Indicator	Hesitancy about randomly talking to visitors. Lack of interest in talking to random people.
Example	Wilson: Some of our friends come. It's nice to see them. But other people... it's always interesting meeting... civilised people. [Extracted interview transcript, garden opener called Wilson]
Exception	Do not mix PFA and PGE (Appendix 55) up for the same reason stated above.

Appendix 57: Code [Request for friend's help]

Label	RFH
Definition/ description	A kind of de-motivation for opening the garden to the public where garden openers hesitate to ask friends to help with opening.
Indicator	Episodes of asking friends for help with hesitation. Exhaustion of having asked them for help every year.
Example	She doesn't like asking her friends to bake for 200 people because there is uncertainty about weather and the number of actual visitors. [Extracted fieldnote, Jessica's garden] Also take a look at Leanna's comment quoted in Appendix 20.
Exception	RFH does not include the hesitancy about rewarding helpers for their assistance.

Appendix 58: Code [Preparation for visitor attraction]

Label	PVA
Definition/ description	A kind of de-motivation for opening the garden to the public where garden openers prepare for visitor attractions such as plant sale or refreshment.
Indicators	References to how hard the preparation was and how he or she

	dealt with it.
Examples	Geraldine: If you want to know one part of it that I find tedious, it is the plant part because I have to start potting up seedlings and plants quite early on in the season. And the tropaeolum, that was the red tropaeolum, I dig that up in the middle of winter outside and pot that up. And then I've got to keep them. And nearer the time I re-pot some and just tidy them up, and do all the labels. Because we do this garden it's just my husband and myself who do the whole the garden, nobody else, and I find that that is a lot of extra work. And it's quite, it's not that I don't like plants cause I love plants. But it's just sort of one step too much really in a way. [Extracted interview transcript, garden opener called Geraldine]
Exclusion	PVA is distinguished from other kinds of preparations for open days (e.g. development and maintenance of garden: Appendix 15).

Appendix 59: Code [Ageing]

Label	AGE
Definition/ description	A kind of de-motivation for opening the garden to the public where garden openers are reluctant to continue their Open Gardens because of fatigue and a sense of inability caused by ageing
Indicators	Mentions of their age and how more energetically they used to garden and open it to the public in the past
Examples	Leanna: My husband is older than me and he's got two [health problems]. He's had surgery on his knees and he's got a [health problem]. And... we can't keep doing this on our own. When we go round the garden, you see how much work's involved. And it's climbing up on a roof or everything. You need to get to it to recover the roses and things like that... We can't keep doing this. We can't afford a gardener. [Extracted fieldnote, garden opener called Leanna]
Exclusion	AGE is different from the general misery of getting older, as it is a demotivation specifically for the continuation of Open Gardens.

Appendix 60: Code [Intrusion]

Label	INT
Definition/ description	A kind of de-motivation for opening the garden to the public where garden openers experience visitor's unauthorised entry into their houses or other areas where public access is not allowed in their properties.
Indicators	References to the experience of encountering strangers inside the house.
Examples	Geraldine: There once was a man in this house. I came and I'd left that door shut... And this older man suddenly, I came into the house and he gave me a fright cause he came out of that door. [Extracted fieldnote, garden opener called Geraldine]
Exclusion	INT does not include cases where the visitor's entry into the house

	and the use of toilet or dining room are allowed.
--	---

Appendix 61: [Code: Competitiveness]

Label	COM
Definition/ description	A kind of de-motivation for opening the garden to the public where garden openers believe competitiveness to exist amongst themselves, and where gazes of other garden openers make them feel pressured and stressed.
Indicators	Lack of confidence in the garden quality and comparison between one's own garden and others' gardens.
Examples	Agnes: Because you don't know what your neighbours are doing... Also you perhaps buy more than you would normally in a way of plants. So it's more expensive. There's a sort of undercurrent of competitiveness. [Extracted interview transcript, garden opener called Agnes]
Exclusion	COM is differentiated from formalised competitions that are held outside Scottish Open Gardens (e.g. Chelsea Flower Show).